

HUMANITY VS MUHAMMAD

A Debate Between
Dr. Ali Sina and R. Shahzad

2003

www.faithfreedom.org

CONTENTS

Preamble

Part I - Assassination

Part II - Religion and Morality

Part III - Rape 1

Part IV - Rape 2

Part V - Rape 3

Part VI - Pedophilia

Part VII - Lewdness and Immorality

Part VIII – Misogyny

Preamble

(Nov. 15, 2003)

**This is the long overdue trial of Islam
and here are the protagonists :**

Defendant:

Muhammad bin Abdallah

Plaintiff:

Humanity (The non-Muslim portion)

Prosecutor:

Ali Sina

Defense Attorney:

Raheel Shahzad (Anyone else is welcome to join)

Courtroom:

Public Opinion

Jury:

You

November 15, 2003

Hello Mr. Sina,

After having stumbled on your website about 2 months ago, I have gone through most of the articles and other material you have on the website. And I must say that I am very impressed by your intellectual capability. This is by no means sarcasm, for I truly appreciate your candor.

Of course, in this age of internet and websites, information dissemination has become fairly easy and can be used for positive or negative purposes, depending upon a person's own convictions about matters.

Hence, I now found the reason to write to you because your site certainly is welcoming of anyone who may seek to have an intellectual discourse about matters of faith. I did not subscribe to the forum because I myself am a webmaster of over 30 sites and I know firsthand that forums sometimes can be very intellectually draining because most of the people are not exactly very consistent. It's like shouting over a thousand heads in hopes that someone may hear you.

Now what's the purpose of my email to you? Well, it is probably twofold, and I will write about it shortly, but before I do that and hope for some kind of response from you, I would like to let you know something about me so that you are in a better position to decide to respond or not. I do want to request that If you do not respond at length, please do just reply back and say "Not interested" (or something to that effect), if for nothing else but only as a matter of fellow-human courtesy. Waiting for email responses is not all it's cracked up to be.

Briefly about me then: I am 33 years old, of Pakistani origin, living in USA for about 12 years now. Before that, I was in Middle East for 20 years, and was born in Karachi Pakistan.

Over the last 2-3 months, I have had a desire to know some more details about matters of faith, which I had really not thought about a lot before. Led a normal life (and normal is relative i know) but since my parents are Muslims, I guess I had to be a Muslim too. I have a Masters Degree in Business, and I have my own business which produces a healthy profit. I am married for 6 years now and have no children yet.

So why was this mini-biography needed? Well, because I think that if I will be successful in persuading you to a public debate about what you have to say about your convictions, then knowing the capacity of the opponent is important. I know yours from your articles, but I am only an email to you so far.

Now the two-fold reason for my email: **1-** To ascertain whether you actually are serious in your request for an intellectual counter-point to your points of view, and **2-** To let you know briefly about what I intend to do, should you amicably accept at least in principle to have an intellectual argument.

The first point will be proven by your response to this email. The second needs brief mentioning here and will be divulged more in detail, should you respond.

I understand the common theme of your articles, which is basically that

- a) The historical facts as reported are tainted
- b) Apologists are scared to show the real facts
- c) Islam is a violent ideology based on medieval notions of faith
- d) Muslim rulers/governments are corrupted by screwed up ideologies
- e) The prophet Muhammad is not at all worthy of anything because his morals leave a lot to be desired based on what is commonly known to many scholars

f) Allah (or God) may be a figment of imagination, and

g) Muslims are by and large indoctrinated with hatred, etc for other religions based on warped teachings from scholars

I'm sure you may not agree with this listing, but this is at least what I understood from your articles. If I have missed the point entirely, I hope you briefly will correct me.

What I intend to do through a debate between two intellectuals (and I am shamelessly calling myself one, but there's no other way for me to say it) is to accomplish 3 things in response to your site's claims and conviction:

A) To prove that your stance on a lot of subjects is not based on an intellectual appealing context

B) That the facts as presented actually are correct in some ways, and maybe a little murky in others, which a thinking muslim person can certainly be a moderate about and respond with equal zeal, because the totality of your claims is certainly worthy of a response on equal footing

C) To finally let you ponder about the possibilities which you either intentionally or otherwise may have missed

Maybe, after the debate, you may find it in your own mind and heart to take a second look at your own convictions and not necessarily shut down your site, but maybe find a more meaningful avenue to vent some of your frustrations with matters of faith.

I have no desire to shut down your site, be combative or abusive, nor am I from the "Jihadi" school of thought where bombs are the only ways of defeating an ideology. I really am looking for a stimulating discourse based on mutual respect of each other's ability to shed more light on what we collectively call "religion". Since we are talking about Islam specifically, that will be the focus.

Before ending this email, I would certainly like to point out that one of the things I will certainly not do or stoop to is the "apology" for any facts that you may present because I understand that facts cannot be disproven (because then they will not be facts at all). So I accept your challenge on basis of an intellectual disagreement with your stance on a lot of subject matter, without resorting to the need for rewriting history.

I await your first response. Even if you do not see it worth the time to engage in an intellectual battle of thoughts, I sincerely hope the best for you. Certainly one day both you and I will die, and if there's any truth or relevance to life after death, I hope that all of us will be dealt with kindness.

And if there's nothing after death, we'll never find out.

Sincerely,

R. Shahzad

Nov. 15, 2003

Dear Mr. Shahzad,

I am very busy for one-on-one debates. Actually I created the forum to take some load off my shoulders. However, I do accept your challenge. I publish our debate in the debate section of the site for everyone to see.

I will be grateful if in each correspondence you tackle just a few aspects that you disagree with me. Brevity makes our debate more readable.

Regards

Ali Sina

Nov. 15, 2003

Dear Mr. Sina,

I am delighted that you have responded in kindness, which to me establishes one positive aspect of your personality: honesty!

My disagreement or agreement is not going to be based then on personality clashes because I have discerned that you are an intellectual, and you deserve admiration at least on that level. I also request that in return, my own conviction about meta-physical aspects be not brought into the mix, since I know absolutely no way of defending it with physical proofs, and I doubt heavily that you will be able to counter that with any physical manifestation too.

Our disagreement or debate will center on things and ideologies pertaining to THIS world. What will happen after both of us die is not known to either of us, we are only told what MAY happen (that's if you take the idea that a Super Nonphysical deity may have communicated something to us through mediums such as prophets). Hence, within the context of THIS world, we can choose to shred apart whatever our intelligence will allow us to conquer.

You requested brevity in subject matter, and that's absolutely understood. Any work of such magnitude as religious literature becomes overwhelming if tackled all at once. So we certainly have to do it in smaller pieces, with the understood underlying principle, that each small aspect is part of a larger picture, and that the smaller fact cannot be tackled without at least keeping the larger picture in mind. Sometimes, it may be necessary to invoke the larger picture if the singular aspect of some discourse does nothing to conform or nullify the bigger ideology.

I sincerely look forward to our debate. As I said in my previous email, what may happen to us after death is not entirely known with certainty to either of us, but as long as our brains are

capable of putting together rational thoughts, we can certainly challenge each other's system of connecting to an abstract bigger picture.

Sincerely,

R Shahzad

Nov. 15, 2003

Dear Mr. Shahzad,

Since you said that you are already familiar with my writings, I was hoping that this time you will start presenting your refutation to my claim that Islam is false and Muhammad was not a messenger of God, but a mentally disturbed man and a charlatan.

Since you did not take that initiative, allow me to present my charges one by one and invite you to refute them.

Through this debate I will assume the role of the prosecutor and you will be representing the defendant Muhammad.

Let us start with the Character of Muhammad. In my view, one who claims to be a messenger of God must be endowed with spiritual qualities such as love, compassion, honesty, self-restraint, etc. Muhammad could not be a messenger of God, because he was a lecherous, immoral and unethical man, bereft of human qualities. He was a ruthless mass murderer, a lustful sex maniac, a shameless pedophile, a cunning assassin, a marauding chieftain, a schizophrenic narcissist, a pathetic liar and many other vile qualities that disqualify him to be a decent human being, let alone a messenger of God.

My other objection of Muhammad's claim to prophethood is the absurdity and inanity of the Quran. It is inconceivable that the author of this magnificent universe be the same person who wrote that asinine book. Is it possible that God be as ignorant of

simple scientific, logical, mathematical, historical and even grammatical facts as the author of the Quran seems to be?

Let us take one subject at a time.

Let us talk about Muhammad the assassin, to begin with.

I accuse Muhammad of being an assassin, a man that has to be despised and scorned and therefore unworthy of assuming such a lofty task of becoming the emissary of God amongst men. After you read those stories, I want you to advocate for his innocence and prove that all these charges are false.

The list is long. I am not going to ask you to read all of them. However, I insist that you read at least four of those stories of assassinations, verify the authenticity of the sources and then defend your client Muhammad and prove his innocence.

www.answering-islam.org/Muhammad/Enemies/abuafak.html

www.answering-islam.org/Muhammad/Enemies/asma.html

www.faithfreedom.org/Articles/sina/assassinations.htm

www.answering-islam.org/Muhammad/Enemies/sallam.html

Kind regards

Ali Sina

Part I

Assassinations

Nov. 16, 2003

Dear Mr. Sina,

You wrote: *“Since you said that you are already familiar with my writings, I was hoping that this time you will start presenting your refutation to my claim that Islam is false and Muhammad was not a messenger of God, but a mentally disturbed man and a charlatan”*

I did not start, since in your email you were busy so I was taking a cue from you as to when you would ask to start. My apologies if I misunderstood. But nonetheless, I was prepared for your charges even before you posted this, because at least I know the theme of your articles :)

You wrote: *“Since you did not take that initiative, allow me to present my charges one by one and invite you to refute them.*

“Through this debate I will assume the role of the prosecutor and you will be representing the defendant Muhammad”.

Since you have allowed me the role of defense counsel, I think then this would mean we employ the same style as one would employ in a courtroom, which basically means that evidence, hearsay, assumptions, leading the witness, etc (as matters of legal discourse) may have a place in this debate too and their use or misuse may be pointed out by either party. I think this is only fair because some discipline needs to be used to keep both sides honest.

You wrote: *“Let us start with the Character of Muhammad. In my view, one who claims to be a messenger of God must be endowed with spiritual qualities such as love, compassion,*

honesty, self-restraint, etc. Muhammad could not be a messenger of God because he was lecherous, immoral and unethical man, bereft of human qualities. He was a ruthless mass murderer, a lustful sex maniac, a shameless pedophile, and a cunning assassin, a marauding chieftain, a schizophrenic narcissist, a pathetic liar and many other vile qualities that disqualify him to be a decent human being let alone a messenger of God”

Ok, so as a starting point, you have leveled some charges against a human being. And this distinction is very important for you and me to assert because we have to judge the individual through our assumed moral code. It seems only fair that the charges, if brought upon a human being, need then to be defended through the notions of all things human. That Muhammad was a human being is not in dispute at all. He was born and then died. That's a strong indicator of him at least conforming to the most basic premise of being a human. The divine connection then is a special characteristic placed upon this human being. And this divine connection is the crux of a large part of our case.

Hence, if it is not in dispute that he was a human first, then I would like to present the definitions of Human (from *dictionary.com*), which at least may assist the defense in guiding the arguments.

“Of, relating to, or characteristic of humans: the course of human events; the human race.

“Having or showing those positive aspects of nature and character regarded as distinguishing humans from other animals: an act of human kindness.

“Subject to or indicative of the weaknesses, imperfections, and fragility associated with humans: a mistake that shows he's only human; human frailty.

“Having the form of a human

“Made up of humans: formed a human bridge across the ice”

So why is the definition of *human* necessary here at all? In my estimation, because what we understand a human to be is guided through our moral code today. And recognizing that we are talking about a human being is central to the issue as we move ahead in this. One of the interesting definitions above is the third one (indicative of the weaknesses or imperfections and fragility)

You wrote: *“In my view, one who claims to be a messenger of God must be endowed with spiritual qualities such as love, compassion, honesty, self-restraint, etc”*

So the first assumption you have already thrown into the case is your own ideal of what a messenger's human standing and qualities should be. This assumption is not created by you in a vacuum, but is to me a product of your deeper appreciation that a God (or at least your interpretation of God) exists. The second assumption you have declared in the statement is that God is good, and possesses the qualities you have listed above. I am not saying that the assumptions are illogical or need to be thrown out, but you have set up a context for God and Messenger through your own interpretation what qualities are positive and God is the embodiment of these qualities. I can also then extend from this that the God you have interpreted is the antithesis of evil and God is not capable of either allowing evil to persist or the plan for our existence was devoid of evil. This also then means to me that evil is not of God creation, but a human created entity as a result of resistance to the good God. Further, that Satan then has no real existence because God is good, and evil is a human product, and anything that is evil or something that does not conform to your and my definition of "good" cannot be from the God. You used the words "must be endowed" and that to me means that the premise of what God should be doing is already established. You then state "spiritual qualities" which further

establishes that you actually have a belief system that recognizes that there is something called "spirit". Hence, now we are making the connection between Muhammad and spirituality. I am not sure whose definition of spirituality we need to establish here. I can infer that "spiritual qualities such as love, compassion, honesty, self-restraint" are desirable. What is not clear to me is that does spirituality as you stated have only these qualities or spirituality extends beyond the listing of human elements stated by you.

But regardless, let me briefly tackle the words you have used to establish the "law" that has been broken:

A) Love - What kind of love are you including here? Is it different based on times, or is it a constant? And is it for other humans, or does it include all things of world and of the other dimension? And does this love include love only of human-approved items or love for anything desired by a human is included? Can love include sex? And if a man claims (and feels) to have fallen in love with another man's wife, is this acceptable as morally upstanding by us? If such claim is made, is it reasonable to accept that there is no lust involved, or is declaration of love for another man's wife an automatic negation of love (as it would then this would mean that a moral code is being broken, not because the love is any less desirable, but because the legality of the woman's status as already married is the real issue).

B) Compassion - Most of the things about love mentioned above are applicable here, with one addition. Is the intensity of compassion an important element, or should compassion also have a barometer of its strength?

C) Honesty - Is honesty desirable in all instances or can there be exceptions?

D) Self-Restraint - Is this restraint from innate evil acts to perform acts that the heart desires, or is this restraint from the acts, which may confound people of past and future? Or both?

The reason why I expanded on this is because establishing a law is first needed in absolute clear terms, for then only can the breaking of this law be defined and then the defendant charged, and then if the absolute clear law as stated is found to be broken, then yes guilt can be established. However, if the law itself is open to interpretation, then the juries will never agree on establishment of guilt because there is no absolute law to begin with. As an example, many laws in USA are either overturned or repealed because of the problem of being either not conforming to a common logic, or being too vague. Many people walk away free without conviction because the law itself is not clearly defined. So the premise is, without an establishment of a clear law, it cannot be really broken.

You wrote: *“My other objection of Muhammad's claim to prophethood is the absurdity and inanity of the Quran. It is inconceivable that the author of this magnificent universe be the same person who wrote that asinine book. Is it possible that God be so ignorant of simple scientific, logical, mathematical, historical and even grammatical facts as the author of the Quran seems to be?”*

Now we move from the qualities you listed above (which I can combine to mean human traits of personality) to the realm of intelligence and knowledge. Your objection is based upon the premise that intelligence is a prerequisite for a divine Being in relation to humans, and that the humans should be capable of understanding divinity from the worldly perspective and divinity needs to be manifested with total clarity. Absurdity and Inanity also needs to be then in terms of violation of intelligence. But the problem with this premise is that intelligence also is then a

relative term. And intelligence is difficult to quantify because it may differ for people based on the subject matter at hand. I may be very intelligent about matters relating to computers for example, and have no clue about medical science. I may be absolutely stupid about chemistry too regardless of how many books I read about it. So intelligence has to be established as to applying to which aspect. I think it is safe to say that you are talking about intelligence in the realms of "logic". Logic being a set of mutually exclusive sets of perceptions, where the commingling of two different perceptions produces no answer, hence the brain refuses to process it.

For example: 1) John and Mary traveled to Bermuda on a boat
2) A boat cannot move if more than one person is occupying it -
Contradiction within the statement defying logic. Hence the two statements in combination are absurd. There cannot be any way of using 1 and 2 as written together above without actually the author stating something additional, or for logic to succeed, some assumptions will have to be used. Because on surface, the above two statements defy logic if said together.

So on this point your objection really is two-fold: a) The Quran as a collection of sentences is absurd defying logic and b) since it defies logic, the author must be a human because the ability to defy logic can only be achieved by a human. God then is either required to conform to the logic of each human at the same time and with clarity, or else He has no right to say anything.

As for the collection of sentences of Quran in totality (verses), that is not the focus of this section of debate, so I will come to that in a later part. But the extension certainly applies to then the charge leveled against a human called Muhammad. Hence, the law we are establishing has to include the violation of

intelligence, in addition to what I have said so far about the violations of the personality code.

You wrote: *“Let us take one subject at a time”.*

I really am trying to do that. I hope I am not veering off too far way.

I am taking each sentence you wrote and carefully answering to the best of my ability given some of the limitations.

You wrote: *“Let us talk about Muhammad the assassin, to begin with.*

“I accuse Muhammad of being an assassin, a man that has to be despised and scorned and therefore unworthy of assuming such a lofty task of becoming the emissary of God amongst men. After you read those stories I want you to advocate for his innocence and prove that all these charges are false”.

Ok, so let's address the assassinations then, and then in a later part I will elaborate. And I do want to remind you that the law being established is expanding or either we then have to split the law into separate portions, which then would have their own problems of not being mutually exclusive.

Assassin, from what I understand, came from the word *"Hashishin"* (some order of Muslims who killed at the orders of some Sheikh back in 17th century and the sheikh prescribed *hashish* for some reason. not entirely clear). So assassination is a fairly recent definition. And assassination means then: “One who murders by surprise attack, especially one who carries out a plot to kill a prominent person”.

Now this definition does not address anything about the virtue or vice of the one being murdered. Neither is the cause being tackled as being one of justice or other. There's also absent the idea of guilt or crime of the person being murdered in this definition. So pretty much, it can be boiled down to just mean

murder. But I think that poses a logical problem for me, if it means only murder by surprise. Is there any room for this act being justified ever? Or it's just that the murder has to happen with the one who is being murdered be informed by a telegraph or email beforehand? Also, is there any way that the assassination be a desirable result? For example, if murder by surprise is assassination and which should be classified as an absolute law that at any time can be applied to any period of history or future, then the party committing it can be classified as guilty. So, if a battalion of US soldiers enter someone's backyard in Iraq and kill the inhabitants of the house, regardless of the vices of those killed, will the US soldiers be called assassins? But if you do not consider them assassins because they are fighting for a perceived just cause according to the interpretation of the US stance on nuclear weapons, then why are some others called assassins who may be fighting their own cause? So if the reason or cause for the murder by surprise is not known exactly, then it's assassination. Otherwise it's something else, which can be stamped as morally upstanding by those who are interpreting the cause in the first place.

By this logic, Muhammad cannot be charged with assassination because his purpose was very well stated. Whether I or you disagree with his stated reason is not the issue here so far. I am not prepared to label my client as an assassin because you have used a word to define the law being broken as "assassination", which by definition only means murder by surprise. But I have tried to demonstrate that this definition is too loose because murder by surprise can also be used as a meaningful tactic in wartime by countries today. Hence, if the purpose of the surprise murder is stated clearly, then it cannot be classified as a crime of assassination. I think your disagreement with the cause that my client was pursuing is leading you to label him as an assassin. But in light of what I have stated for the jury,

your label is unfair and unnecessary. My client can be guilty of the law we establish first, and if you want to accuse him and find guilty of assassination, you have to state your position as to what an act of assassination is supposed to encompass. If you mean that he murdered and we forget the word assassin, then murdering also has similar issues of not being very clearly defined. But I'm trying to add more here in interest of brevity.

I do, however, want to state clearly here that the word "assassin" has a certain connotation, which I think is unfair to my client.

You wrote: *"The list is long. I am not going to ask you to read all of them. However, I insist that you read at least four of those stories of assassinations, verify the authenticity of the sources and then defend your client Muhammad and prove his innocence".*

:) Yes, I know the list can be overwhelming. But I have done a lot of research as the defense counsel, and based on the rules of this debate, I can only tackle one issue at a time, which I think is desired by you too.

You have pointed out that I verify the authenticity of the sources, which I think is an unfair demand. This does not mean that I have not tried to verify or have rejected them; I'm only saying that your accusation is based on your insistence that I use the same source to defend my client as you find appealing to your own position. This also does not mean that I have some hidden revolutionary new source that no one knows about, but if we are establishing a law that was broken within the realm of logic and this world, then you are limiting my sources by excluding some of the most important sources that I may want to use, namely commonsense and logic itself. If you as the prosecutor are allowed the liberty to use any source as you deem befitting, then I should be at least given the fair chance of stating

whether I believe in the source or not, and whether it conforms to my own stated position or not. Because unless you establish some common source that we both can refer to and absolutely agree on its usefulness for both sides, I will be overwhelmed in defending the client. Even the Supreme Court of USA has established points of references for every case it hears. If it had to decipher each and every source of law that ever existed or exists today, it will go nuts just trying to pour over all the material.

Hence rules of evidence need to be established at least to have some sanity surrounding this debate. Past cases adjudicated one way or another is not evidence to me; they are just cases which may or may not have any application today. Opinions or hearsay are also not evidence. Stated Positions or Prejudiced slants are also not evidence. So unless there's some common understanding of evidence, it's pretty much a free for all kind of case, where guilt is assumed before adjudication.

I propose that we limit our use of the material that can be referenced to establish the law and then argue over guilt or innocence.

I would like to mention that my job is not really to prove innocence; my exercise is to demonstrate that the guilt cannot be proven or established beyond any doubt. Proving innocence is practically impossible given the limitations of passage of time, but if a human being is accused of a crime, then at least he needs to be defended against the establishment of guilt.

Hence to conclude this part of my response, I should summarize my opening statements:

1. Your accusations have many built-in assumptions
2. Your standards of norms and intelligence are not entirely clear based on accusations

3. Your use of the word "*assassin*" is difficult to establish and is inherently judgmental in favor of the one who got killed

4. The sources of evidence need to be clear and limited in scope.

5. "Innocence until proven guilty beyond doubt" is my current stated position

I will continue in my next response about the specific cases of "assassinations", address the issues of accusations of pedophilia and marriages of Muhammad, and about the Quran. Let me remind you and the readers that when you take into account that the faith basis of millions of people is at stake here, I think this task is a noble cause both for you and I think for me. I also ask the readers to please keep an open mind about both sides of the issue, and not let your own preset feelings about matters of faith guide your logic.

I am only but an individual trying to make sense of my faith and those who hold a different point of view.

R Shahzad

Nov. 16, 2003

Dear Mr. Shahzad,

I accused your defendant Muhammad of being an assassin and from the several cases available I presented just four. You did not deny the charges and the authenticity of my exhibits. That is, of course, hard to deny since these cases are reported in basically all original Islamic sources such as Ibn Ishaq's *Sirat Rasulallah*, al Waqidi, al Tabari and several sahih (authentic, verified) hadiths.

Since the evidence is undeniable, you tried to redefine the notion of *human being* and *assassination*.

In your defense, you stated that Muhammad was just a human and explained to us what *human* means. I agree with those premises. You emphasized that as a human, Muhammad was subject to weaknesses or imperfections and fragility. I agree with that too. However, none of those justifies assassinations. All criminals are humans and the same rule of human weakness applies to them too. Is that an excuse to acquit them all? Hardly so!

I doubt any jury in his right mind would acquit a criminal on the ground that he or she is just a fallible human being. We are all fallible human beings, but not all of us are assassins. You would have had a better chance to plead innocence by reason of insanity for your client.

Then you moved on to redefine the concept of good and evil and stated that my notion of good and how I envision God are subjective.

You spoke of human love being relative and asked whether, when we speak of love, we should not also take morality into equation.

You wondered whether compassion needs a barometer of strength.

You questioned the desirability of honesty in all cases and wondered whether there can be exceptions when being dishonest is more desirable.

And about Self-Restraint, you asked: *“Is this restraint from innate evil acts to perform acts that the heart desires, or is this restraint from the acts which may confound people of past and future? Or both?”*

These questions are irrelevant to the case.

You stated that the reason why you present these questions is because you are not sure that the right and wrong as seen by

humans are actually so. In other words, you try to question the validity of human notion of good and evil. And based on such premise you claimed that since we cannot be certain that what appears to be good is actually good and what appears to be bad is actually bad then we cannot say assassination is bad because it could be good. And you concluded: “*without an establishment of a clear law, it cannot be really broken.*”

I do not think that good and bad are so relative that we can't know whether assassinating someone on the ground that he or she disagrees with us is a good thing or not. May be good and evil for us humans are relative. But our intelligence, no matter how imperfect and relative it may be, is the only tool we have to tell apart good from bad. It is absurd to say that assassination could be a good thing because we are fallible humans and can't know the difference between good and bad.

Love and compassions are also human qualities. Morality is another subject that we can talk about in another occasion. The point is that a human being who is bereft of these qualities does not qualify to be called with that name. We call such person “monster,” not human.

And as for your question about honesty, the answer is that honesty is always desirable and dishonesty is always undesirable. There are no exceptions.

What you are advocating here is *moral relativism*. In other words, you say evil is justifiable when doing ‘good’ is not expedient. This is absurd because it licenses any person to do evil at any time that it suites him.

I am not shocked at all of your philosophy. You are expounding the Islamic philosophy very eloquently. As a confirmation of your statement and to show that Islam is indeed a ‘moral relativist’ religion that allows dishonesty, assassination and other vices any time that it suites its followers, I will quote a

statement by Iman Ghazali, the most eminent Islamic scholar ever.

Ghazali wrote: *"When it is possible to achieve such an aim by lying but not by telling the truth, it is permissible to lie if attaining the goal is permissible"* (Ref: Ahmad Ibn Naqib al-Misri, *The Reliance of the Traveller*, translated by Nuh Ha Mim Keller, Amana publications, 1997, section r 8.2, page 745).

I disagree with moral relativism. I am a follower of the Golden Rule. The Golden Rule states: *"Do not do to others what you do not want to be done to you"*.

I do not want to be assassinated and hence I do not assassinate others.

I do not want another person to invade my town, kill me, loot my belonging, enslave my children and sleep with my wife. So I do not do such things to others.

I do not enjoy being second class citizen, being subdued and humiliated and paying penalty for my right to believe in the religion of my choice, hence I do not do this to others.

I do not like to have a tutelary who can beat me if I fail to obey. Therefore, I do not treat my wife in this manner.

I do not like to be dealt with dishonestly, be lied to and cheated. Therefore, I think dishonesty is evil and there are no exceptions to this rule.

Continuing with the same line of moral relativism, you argued that the human intelligence is also relative and it cannot comprehend the divine wisdom.

You wrote: *"God then is either required to conform to the logic of each human at the same time and with clarity, or else He has no right to say anything."*

My response is also the same. Human intelligence may be imperfect, but that is all we have. Our limited intelligence is the

only parameter or tool with which we have to distinguish the right from the wrong and evil from the good. Otherwise, how would we tell apart a charlatan and impostor from a true messenger of God? There are thousands of impostors who lay claim to prophethood each year. How do we know they are not telling the truth and Muhammad was? We have to use our intelligence. Yes, the same imperfect and fallible intelligence. If the actions and words of these self-proclaimed prophets defy our intelligence, then we know that they are impostors. It would be unfair for God to send a messenger that says and does things contrary to our intelligence. Galileo said, *"If God did not want us to use our intelligence, why would he give it to us?"*

By weighing up the Quran and the deeds of Muhammad with our human intelligence, we can safely determine that he did not qualify to be a messenger of God, unless you are of the opinion that God is so pathetic that he would choose a pervert criminal psychopath thug to guide us to the right path.

On the main subject of our discussion, namely assassination, you explained the root and the meaning of the word (which I find unnecessary because it makes your long responses, longer)

You wrote: *"this definition [of assassination] does not address anything about the virtue or vice of the one being murdered."* And continued: *"There's also absent the idea of guilt or crime of the person being murdered in this definition."*

I am afraid you are confusing the issue. We are not talking about the virtue and vice of the victim, but the virtue and vice of the assassin. The question that you have to answer is whether assassination is a virtuous act befitting of a messenger of God or it is an evil deed. The guilt or innocence of people should be determined by a court of law, not whimsically by anyone who just feels he has to assassinate someone because this person is badmouthing him.

Then you equated assassination with murder and wondered: *“Is there any room for this act [assassination/ murder] being justified ever? Or it's just that the murder has to happen with the one who is being murdered be informed by a telegraph or email beforehand?”*

Here you are not questioning the immorality of assassination, but whether the assassin should inform his victim of his intentions. I think you miss the whole point. I am not trying to convince you but the jury (our readers). And the jury needs no more convincing.

I am going to quote verbatim your own statement. I think your own words incriminate your client (and his followers) more convincingly than anything I can say.

You wrote: *“Also, is there any way that the assassination be a desirable result? For example, if murder by surprise is assassination and which should be classified as an absolute law that at any time can be applied to any period of history or future, then the party committing it can be classified as guilty. So, if a battalion of US soldiers enter someone's backyard in Iraq and kill the inhabitants of the house, regardless of the vices of those killed, will the US soldiers be called assassins? But if you do not consider them assassins because they are fighting for a perceived just cause according to the interpretation of the US stance on nuclear weapons, then why are some others called assassins who may be fighting their own cause? So if the reason or cause for the murder by surprise is not known exactly, then it's assassination. Otherwise it's something else, which can be stamped as morally upstanding by those who are interpreting the cause in the first place”.*

“By this logic, Muhammad cannot be charged with assassination because his purpose was very well stated. Whether I or you disagree with his stated reason is not the issue here so far. I am not prepared to label my client as an assassin because you have used a word to define the law being broken as

"assassination", which by definition only means murder by surprise. But I have tried to demonstrate that this definition is too loose because murder by surprise can also be used as a meaningful tactic in wartime by countries today. Hence, if the purpose of the surprise murder is stated clearly, then it cannot be classified as a crime of assassination. I think your disagreement with the cause that my client was pursuing is leading you to label him as an assassin. But in light of what I have stated for the jury, your label is unfair and unnecessary. My client can be guilty of the law we establish first, and if you want to accuse him and find guilty of assassination, you have to state your position as to what an act of assassination is supposed to encompass. If you mean that he murdered and we forget the word assassin, then murdering also has similar issues of not being very clearly defined. But I'm trying to add more here in interest of brevity".

Thank you for being so explicit. I do not think I need to add anything more. I can rest my case at this moment. However, since many of our readers are also Muslims and since I know how Islam affects human mind and values and distorts them to the extent that the victim become jaundiced, I would like to shed some light on this kind of typically convoluted Islamic thinking and hopefully rescue some from this disease of the mind and soul called Islam.

You wrote: *"If a battalion of US soldiers enter someone's backyard in Iraq, and kill the inhabitants of the house regardless of the vices of those killed, will the US soldiers be called assassins?"*

Yes, if that happens, those soldiers will be charged with war crime and will have to stand trial.

This twisted Islamic thinking that likes to portray Muslims as victims, with no evidence at all, while justifying all their crimes perpetrated against others, is typical also.

The US soldiers do not enter in people's houses and murder them indiscriminately. They may enter in people's houses in search of weapons or to capture a combatant enemy. However, they will not open fire on the residents unless they are attacked first.

That is not comparable to the assassination expeditions of Muhammad. From the links that I provided, we learn that Muhammad sent someone to assassinate a 120-year old man, because he was telling the people of Medina not to be fooled by Muhammad. When Asma bint Marwan, a poetess and mother of five small children, complained about that dastardly act, he sent another man to assassinate her too in the middle of the night while she was in her bed nursing her infant. I hope you also read the case of Kab ibn Ashraf and Abu Rafi. These are the kinds of crimes perpetrated by your defendant, whom a billion gullible people blindly have accepted as a messenger of God. And yet look how he mocks everyone and how he makes his ever handy god to praise him so loftily:

"And surely thou hast sublime morals" (Q.68:4).

"Indeed in the Messenger of Allah you have a good example to follow" (Q.33:21).

"We sent thee not, but as a Mercy for all creatures. (Q.21:107).

"Verily this is the word of a most honorable Messenger," (Q.81.19)

We want to shed light on these facts and unmask Muhammad so that haply we save the Muslims, who are primary victims of this lie, and save the world from an unnecessary calamity.

However, we are helpless to save those whose minds and values are distorted to a point of no return. Islam is indeed the disease of the mind. We want to help Muslims recover, but we can't help everyone. I am afraid you are one of those who are beyond recovery.

A man that justifies assassination, questions whether dishonesty could sometimes be good, and has succumbed to Islamic moral relativism to such an extent that he cannot see the obvious, is beyond reach of reason.

I nevertheless thank you for your honesty in this case, even though you think dishonesty sometimes is necessary, for not denying futilely the authenticity of the hadiths and other historic sources that reveal the crimes perpetrated by your defendant Muhammad. You even admit that you do not have "*some hidden revolutionary new source that no one knows about*". You only contend that since assassination, dishonesty and other vices "can sometimes be good" and we humans cannot tell one way from other, Muhammad cannot be accused of any crime.

In other words, your position is to mock human conscience, human intelligence and our common sense. You state that man cannot know what is wrong and what is right, and therefore any vice committed by Muhammad could actually be a virtue in disguise.

Is that true in the case of all criminals? Or Muhammad is the exception?

Interestingly, you suggested we use "common sense" and "logic" to determine the guilt or innocence of Muhammad.

What common sense and what logic are you talking about? Isn't it obvious that assassination is not right? That pedophilia is not good? That raiding, looting and enslaving women and children is wrong?

Yet again, you ended up contradicting yourself by stating that, "*If you as the prosecutor are allowed the liberty to use any source as you deem befitting, then I should be at least given the fair chance of stating whether I believe in the source or not, and whether it conforms to my own stated position or not.*"

Now it seems that you are implying that the sources that I provided, namely the sahih hadith and early books of history written by early Muslim historians, may not be valid. If so, can you present another version of history of Islam? Of course, there is none and you already acknowledged that you do not have “some hidden revolutionary new source that no one knows about”.

You wrote: *“I would like to mention that my job is not really to prove innocence; my exercise is to demonstrate that the guilt cannot be proven or established beyond any doubt. Proving innocence is practically impossible given the limitations of passage of time, but if a human being is accused of a crime, then at least he needs to be defended against the establishment of guilt.”*

I do not have to prove any guilt because it is confessed. It is enough to read the books of history and the hadith written by devout Muslims to see how they bragged about these crimes perpetrated by their prophet.

The prosecution in the case of *Humanity vs. Muhammad bin Abdallah* rests. It is now up to the jury to deliberate on the verdict.

Ali Sina

For the next court session, I invite you to refute my charge against Muhammad being a lecherous womanizer. I contend that considering his lack of moral fortitude Muhammad could not be a messenger of God. He was simply a successful and ruthless cult leader who beguiled the foolhardy ignorant people of his time to satisfy his own ambitions and lusts.

In the following links, I have presented my claim with enough evidence to back it up.

- *Juwairiyah*
- *Safiyah: the Jewish wife of Muhammad*
- *Adoption in Islam and Muhammad's Marriage to Zainab Bint Jahsh.*
- *Mariyah The Coptic Sex Slave of the Prophet*
- *Propaganda from an apologist: a straight reply*

Please read all of them.

P.S. I do not want to sound triumphalist as I know this is one of the "virtues" of Muslims. However, judging by your poor performance in this first round, I invite you to gang up with other Muslims and build up a stronger defense.

I invite any other Muslim who wants to join the defense team and salvage the lost honor of their prophet to pitch in.

If you are a Muslim who are dismayed and think someone else can do better a job than Mr. Shahzad, please invite him. Tell him it is vital because the honor of Islam is at stake.

I hereby promise once again: should anyone prove my charges against Muhammad to be false, I will not only withdraw this site but also will appear in any television and radio and announce to the world that I was wrong and Islam is true.

There are over a billion Muslims in this planet. Is there not just one who can prove me wrong?

Even the hypocrite and the paid western apologists of Islam are welcome to join the defense. Please tell your Saudi sponsors to fill up your bank accounts again as you are going to defend Islam once more rehashing the lies that Quran is scientific and Islam is peaceful and shut down this pesky site that has brought

so much humiliation and disgrace to the religion of Allah and his messenger.

It must be noted that the humiliation and disgrace of Islam means freedom and glory of its primary victims, namely the Muslims.

Freedom and glory for all the people of the world is what Faith Freedom International is striving for.

Part II

Religion and Morality

Nov. 18, 2003

From **Raheel Shahzad** to **Ali Sina**:

I find your conclusions in Part 1 of the debate entirely premature, bordering on disingenuous and dishonest. I submit that you yourself broke some rules of debate and intellectual discourse which you had set up yourself, and asked me to agree to. You gave the debate the platform of a virtual court case, but then failed to recognize some inherent rules of the setup.

This is by no means a critique of your ability or common sense, but the style which you employed in your response. Let me elaborate as to how this is perceived by me:

You wrote:

*“Defendant: **Muhammad bin Abdallah***

*Plaintiff: **Humanity***

*Prosecutor: **Ali Sina***

*Defense Attorney: **Rahee Shahzad** (Anyone else is welcome to join)*

Courtroom: Public Opinion

Jury: You”

You stated very clearly in the beginning you are the prosecutor, but in your response you then became the judge and jury because you actually convicted and passed sentence yourself. Then, if the plaintiff is humanity, you included all of humanity, which includes everyone living in past and present, which has to obviously include Muslims too. But what if a certain portion of humanity is not the plaintiff at all? You then included me also as the plaintiff by extension, and then listed me as defense attorney, which I cannot be at the same time. Of course, you can say that you and I and everyone reading can employ commonsense and see what you actually used as a context and agree with you in coming to the conclusion. But the commonsense element is not an automatic given for everyone of equal quantity and value, so in essence it is your own commonsense and what you perceive as those sympathetic to your own stated position. This then means that commonsense is entirely under the purview of you, and those whose commonsense reaches a variable conclusion is not commonsense but a fallacy. Which means commonsense, according to you, is not common in many millions, hence then that automatically discards them as being plaintiff or jury.

The other norm of discourse you broke is one of civility. I mean of course we are only in a virtual debate, but indictment of each other's motives or resources or moral and intellectual capability has really no bearing on the charges you brought. If your desire is one of honest discourse in prosecuting, then indictment of the defense attorney is not the tactic I think you need to employ. I was very open in my introduction to you that you seem a brilliant person, and that I do not doubt your

intelligence, but only wanted to address you over issues of faith and its implication on society at large.

In the next few paragraphs, I have taken the liberty to digress from the case and invoke the larger picture, and some of it borders on philosophical aspect of FFI mission. I urge the reader to consider it carefully. The following is not in defense of any particular religion, but statements of general disagreements with certain aspects:

Mr. Sina, I think then it is disingenuous and dishonest to be saying one thing, and then practicing the entirely opposite. If saving humanity is your cause, then cursing a portion of the humanity or ridiculing a big portion of that humanity throws doubt on your actual motive and mental makeup. I certainly do not want this to be a clash of styles, but I am addressing your own stated mission on this FFI site. And I buy into the idea that you are tired of the hatred that Islam supposedly indoctrinates in all the Muslims equally. But how then does the defense really defend if you yourself are displaying the same hatred yourself which is driving your decisions about life and matters of faith anyway. If love for humanity is so overpowering for you, then what is the purpose of taking a portion of the humanity and attack them implicitly or explicitly. And anyone who follows that particular brand of religion is then automatically incapable of addressing your issues. The tactic you employ to ostensibly ignite the fire of love and acceptance in many people's heart is itself ridden with hate and dislike, at least from your first response to Part 1. In effect, what you really ridicule Islam as preaching (namely hate, which drives some people to irrational actions) is manifesting in you too. Of course, you can claim that you are dissatisfied with Islam because it gives a message of hatred, but how does one eradicate hatred with more hatred? Does this not seem circular to you, where declaring a mental war

against the same people in effect is supposed to save the same people you actually are fighting?

I understand that this is going into issues of philosophical differences, but even if you really do not agree or disagree with me at some point, at least as a fellow human I can certainly ask you to please have a second look at your own style and your own view of rationality. Ignore me as a Muslim or whatever, but even if I was an atheist or conformed to your own position, can I not really ask you that I find your tactic intellectually draining. If I agreed with all you said about the religion of Islam, will you then allow me the ability to critique you purely on the basis that I really want to correct you? Just as you are concerned about humanity, can I request that you are also part of humanity to me and that I can wish you well and have an intellectual difference with you?

If your anger with whatever has transpired in your own life is of such great magnitude that the context of your own and my existence is no value anymore, then how do I really believe that you are really interested in saving humanity? If saving me from the clutches of Islam is not being achieved by you purely on an intellectual basis, how do I believe that you will save others with whatever the essence of your message is?

The reason this is all important for me to continue is that regardless of how you choose to indict the religion, Allah, Mohammad or whatever else, it is ultimately connected to a bigger picture. And I had said before that the larger picture is of supreme importance to me since I also am part of the humanity that you want to save. Regardless of the number of Muslims, how will they reject a message or messenger that is being indicted, by the person who himself then tends to show the same traits as being indicted. For the non-intellectuals to be ridden from the clutches of Islam, is it not important that the

intellectuals be convinced first? Who then will have to get in positions of power and then ask the people to reconsider? But if the new message is based on a new messenger (not the divine sense) who is being perceived as having the same kind of moral deficiency that the defendant had according to you.

We can certainly throw articles and books at each other, but in doing so, what exact goal or mission is desired? On a human level, I too am concerned about humanity just as you state you are. I too see oppression and suffering in many places. I too have the moral code that you stated in your first response. My being a Muslim suddenly does not negate that I too have feelings of compassion for humanity. My desire to have a debate with you on an intellectual level is still some evidence to me that I find you capable of displaying genuine feelings of honesty and passion. But I get the impression that you seem to get away in our virtual courtroom from the bigger picture that is the crux of the case you brought.

If somehow or another your stance succeeded, and let's assume you got rid of Islam as your mission states, what options have you really left a big portion of the humanity? In such a complicated case, if establishing crimes of a person is the only motive, then I'm not sure if you really have considered all the dilemmas that it will bring to the society at large. There are just too many considerations here to list, hence I will use the domino effect example: Let's assume that I agreed with your conclusion as you prematurely stated in Part 1, then the bigger picture is that it will then have to lead to rejection of all text attributable to the person indicted here, which in turn will have to lead to rejection of the scripture called Quran, which then will have to lead to the moral dilemma of which scripture is really sacred, which since this current defendant is accused of having concocted will inevitably lead to all prior scriptures being rejected by the same people who rejected the Quranic verses, and then all connection

of humanity in any physical form to divinity is entirely suspect, and ultimately the humanity will have to come to terms with the idea that there actually is nothing sacred that actually identifies God, and if God itself is a suspect entity, then all good and evil will have to be judged on human morals, which humans of future times will ultimately have to design for people to follow, and then moral relativism will be the rule of the day. Those in power then may abuse the authority they have over morals, and then the humanity is plunged into the same problem once again of no real code of ethics from any divine connection. Humans may be in a worst position that they are today. Hence eradication of the thought of God, or leaving it entirely open to interpretation without any real framework is a LOT more damaging to me than the damage that is being caused today. And that's how I worry about humanity today. Ultimately, I really agree with your mission, but in a very different way. So compassion for humanity and considerations based on some logic should not be monopolized by those who think there is no God or Islam is evil. And I think your conclusion of Part 1 is to me disingenuous in this regard, because you have not elaborated on what the course of action should be or what dangers will have to be addressed if one followed through on your logic and code. You would have to at some point employ moral relativism yourself, which you actually rejected in part 1 so eloquently, because without this relativism, you are leaving people really no other choice. If the ostensible leader of the mission is rejecting what ultimately would have to be employed to further the world in absence of God or any notion of divinity through some physical manifestation past or future, then the people are really screwed. Ultimately, "Morality" will be the religion. And what guarantee is there that morality will not be rejected or changed? Those people following your own brand of God might as well be called "Moralist".

If your real motive is actually to just look at a small area of a complex subject and you find peace in ridiculing the defendant for some egotistical purposes, then yes I also understand that part. And I am even then not offended by that. You are displaying then a very normal human trait, one of irrational anger pointed at a certain item, without regard to the consequences or consideration of the big picture. And I doubt if humanity can be saved through this tactic. One billion people, or more, if side with Mr. Sina, will have no real framework. It may be a free for all, where crime may be rampant, and regimes may still employ the tactics used today, but only under the banner of "Morality". THAT is a very disturbing outcome. In fact, the oppression may pale the oppression being witnessed today. Or on the other extreme, human decadence is a huge risk. The religion of "Morality" will have its own leaders, and will still fight other religions on basis of morality.

Hence, if you are right Mr. Sina, and you really wish people to reject Islam, then you would have to impose a moral code on those people who side with you. And your moral code will have to be used I think as an example, based on simple commandments, or lack thereof I guess. If you leave people to fend for themselves and develop their own moralities, then are you guaranteeing that Iran will not impose "Hijab" on its citizens? And let's say they really allowed people to just go about and have total freedom of thought and actions, then what will happen to those who twist your own moral code? You would then ask them to reject the moral code that they have developed freely. Maybe you will not be offended, but someone from your group may be offended. What if the moral code became so amazingly free that exchanging wives by husbands for a night is the morality in some part of the world, not based on any really code, but just free morals, would you still find that act to be correct? Well then Islam got eradicated, replaced by a new

strange religion. And you really cannot expect those you convert in humanity to accept any other religion but basically morality as yardstick. That means you will have to trust the same people you are trying to save that they are actually good decent people who have morals and commonsense. So why is it that their morals are all screwed up if they are branded as Muslims? If they changed that name to "Morality", what changes in practice would you like to see and what government will impose that?

Hence, I have to invoke this big picture here because A) You did not prove your case with conviction B) You have not left the jury or plaintiff with any real path to follow C) You displayed disregard for the same rules you set yourself and D) You convicted the defendant yourself without the defense counsel or jury having heard the entire case and its aspects.

In the next session, I will get back to the case at hand then, which I remind again the readers is not something of trivial value, but the fate of humanity hinges on it, and so the larger picture HAS to be kept in mind. I care about humanity just as Mr. Sina ostensibly cares. I just don't want it to be in a worse shape than what it may be in today.

I want to continue from Part 1 and address alleged assassinations, etc from a more practical point of view.

Ali Sina to Rahee Shahzad

Dear Mr. Shahzad,

Allow me to clarify the first two objections that you raised regarding my style and the choice of the title of '*Humanity vs. Muhammad*'.

You accused me of being unfair and that as the prosecutor I have also assumed the role of the judge and the jury.

That is not true! The jury is the reader. As a prosecutor, I am convinced of my own findings and the charges that I level against your client. If I had any doubts, I would not have started the suit in the first place. I find it unreasonable for you to ask me to doubt my own statements when I already did that and find the truth and you are still there not allowing any doubt to perturb your solid and yet unfounded convictions.

Being born in the same Islamic milieu, I too was overwhelmed by fear and hesitated for a long time to make my doubts come to the surface and then known publicly. Fear is a very powerful instrument of domination and control. Especially the fear drilled at childhood is virtually indestructible. I was not immune to that. Everything I read about Islam did not make sense to me, yet the fear of hell and eternal punishment that was inculcated in my subconscious did not let me sever my umbilical cord from Islam. I did not start my battle against Islam until I overcame that fear and it became absolutely clear to me that Muhammad was not a messenger of any real god but an impostor. That is why I am acting today as the prosecutor against him. I am convinced of him not being anything but a cult leader and evil man. It is up to you to prove me wrong. And just as I am not holding my breath to convince you that Islam is false and all I am interested is to reach the jury, you too should not be dismayed of my confidence about the end result of this trial but rather you should address them too and convince them of the innocence of your client and that I am wrong. Who cares if I already made my mind? The jury is listening and they have the final say. At the end of this debate, they will decide whether I am right or just a stubborn nutcase.

You also objected that I used the title ‘Humanity vs. Muhammad’. I do not think that is technically wrong. When a prosecutor indicts a John Doe, the case is called: “People vs. John Doe”. But the indictee, his attorney and all his friends and

fans are also people, yet they are not the plaintiffs. I hope you get my drift. Anyway, not wanting to dwell on the style, I added in parenthesis (the non-Muslim portion of it) in front of the Humanity as the plaintiff. I hope this satisfies you and we can move on to talk about the case.

You also complained that I indicted the defense attorney. I do not think I did that. My attack is on Islam and not on your fine person. Of course, I stated once that I do not have any hopes that you will ever be able to see the truth based of your very unfair statements that assassination and dishonestly, if expedient, are not always bad and your unfair statement about the American soldiers entering the houses of people and murdering them point plank. This is war crime. If this is happening, we want to know the details so we can bring those soldiers to justice. Can you substantiate your accusations or was it just a little libel, the kind of expedient lies or Taqiyah that Imam Ghazali was saying is okay?

Of course, you and I are squared against each other and that is our job. I am here to prosecute Muhammad and it is your responsibility to defend him. I must be convinced of my own statements or I would be a hypocrite and a liar. The same also I expect from you. I could be wrong, but I should not be a liar. I am obliged to back up everything I say with exhibits. It is up to you to cast doubt on my exhibits and question their relevance and validity. Likewise you must back up your statements too. When you accuse the American soldiers of war crimes, can you back up your statement? Can you produce the evidence and reliable witnesses? If you can do that, you should not waste your time in front of your computer. You should be heading to the United Nations right away and letting the International courts follow up your claims.

Talks are cheap. When you have accepted to be the attorney in this court of the public opinion, you are bound to abide by the same code of ethics that any attorney has to abide, and that is

honesty. (Okay "attorney" and "honesty" in one sentence somehow elicits smile. But that is another issue). Just be prepared to substantiate whatever you say. That is what I am trying to say.

You wrote: *"If saving humanity is your cause, then cursing a portion of the humanity or ridiculing a big portion of that humanity throws doubt on your actual motive and mental makeup"*

This statement is wrong. I am not cursing a portion of humanity. I am denouncing an ideology that a portion of humanity has embraced. Does an ideology become true and sacrosanct when more people adhere to it? At what point is it okay to critique an ideology and at what point it become a taboo? Should we refrain from critiquing all the ideologies? How about neo-Nazism, for example? There are thousands (if not more) people who follow this doctrine religiously. Should we stop criticizing Hitler because this might offend the sensibility of white supremacists? Or perhaps is it okay to critique doctrines with smaller followings, but we should not critique those that are followed by a substantive portion of humanity? Is that the criteria? So was it okay to critique Islam when it was new and only a handful of people believed in it? But then again we see that Muhammad sent assassins to silence his critics from the very early on. At the same time he was criticizing, maligning and taunting the religion of the Quraish and then that of the Jews and the Christians, saying they had adulterated their religions and what they had was not the true religion anymore.

So basically what Islam teaches and what you are telling me here is that we are not allowed to critique Islam. That is the crux of the matter. It is okay to critique every other belief but not Islam? Did I understand you correctly?

This rule is applied in all Islamic countries. Anyone who speaks against Islam and Muhammad will be charged with

blasphemy and dealt with mercilessly. However, at FFI we critique every ideology. We question and doubt the sanctity of every time-honored belief. And inspired by the wise man Buddha, we doubt everything to find our own light.

So critiquing Islam is not inseminating hate. Ideologies are not people.

However, when Quran says,

Slay the idolaters wherever you find them Q.9:5

Let not the believers take for friends or helpers unbelievers Q.3:28 or

O you who believe! Verily, the Mushrikun (unbelievers) are Najasun (impure). Q. 9:28

That is inciting hate. That kind of talk must stop.

You wrote: *“if establishing crimes of a person is the only motive, then I'm not sure if you really have considered all the dilemmas that it will bring to the society at large”.*

In this statement you seem to imply that truth is not your main concern. You are more afraid of how the discovery of the truth may affect the society.

My personal conviction is that truth is always better. Truth may only hurt our feelings for a while. People like to cling to the lies that they hold dear to their hearts and letting go those lies is not that easy. However, we get over it. But falsehood can really wreak disasters. False beliefs can be very dangerous.

Take the example of Nazism. It was based on a false belief that the Arian race came from the lost continent of Atlantis and it was this race that introduced civilization to the rest of the world. As we saw, the belief itself may look innocuous but the consequence was devastating. Imagine the nightmare and the loss of so many lives just for a lie about the superiority of the Arian race.

Today we are heading towards another world scale catastrophe instigated and driven by another lie. This impending catastrophe could be even more horrendous than anything humanity has experienced so far. The lie is Islam. Islam teaches its benighted followers that they are superior to the infidels, that they have to wage war and make Islam dominate the world, that if ten of them confront 100 infidels they will win because Allah will make them victorious, that at the end the world will become Islamic, that if they die in the battle, they will go to heaven and will get to sleep with a multitude of high bosom virgins. And when a big portion of humanity believes in this lie, it becomes a ticking bomb.

Frankly I see no other way to stop this disaster than to defuse this bomb. And that is the mission of FFI.

We want to reach the Muslims and tell them that Islam is false before it is too late. Sometime I have nightmares and think, maybe, it is already too late. Your brothers are devising chemical WMD. They are planning to kill hundreds of thousands of people this time. If that happen the hell will break loose. The reaction of the world would be devastating. Insanity will prevail and millions if not billions will perish. Is there anyone listening? Are you thinking I am just a rabid mad, prophet of doom and gloom just scare mongering? Don't you hear the threats coming from the Al Qaida? Don't you see the support that this terrorist group enjoys across the board among the Muslims? This insanity is pushing the world to the brink of destruction. Someone must do something! But who is listening damn it?! Who is paying attention? How many more innocent people should die before the world realizes that the problem is not the terrorists but Islam that breeds these terrorists?

The Bigger Picture

You invited the jury to look at the bigger picture. The bigger picture in your opinion is that the realization that Islam is a false religion is not as crucial as leaving the world without religion. In

other words it is better to cling to a false religion than no religion at all. You predicted chaos and the decline of morality. You warned that without religion “moral relativism will be the rule of the day”.

I disagree. First of all as we saw moral relativism is a characteristic of Islam. It is Islam that condones evil if the outcome of that benefits Islam and the Muslims. Moral relativism means justifying the means by the end.

However, I do believe that morality is relative but not in the Islamic sense. I believe morality is relative to history and culture. In Islam morality is relative to the interests of Islam and the desire to win at all costs. Islam teaches one can do evil if with that Islam is benefited.

Islamic ethics does not concern itself with right/wrong, good/bad but with halal (permitted by Sharia) and haram (forbidden by Sharia). In fact Islamic ethics is an oxymoron. Islam is not concerned about ethics at all. The discussion of ethics is alien to Muslims "philosophers".

Ethics enjoin that the violation of the rights of any human being is wrong. This is not the case in Islam. Islam does not regard as full human beings those who are not Muslims and hence their rights are not the same as the rights given to Muslims. Women in Islam do not have the same rights as men. In Islam, it is the Sharia that dictates what is wrong and what is right.

Ethics is derived from human conscience and the Golden Rule. Any reasonable person is capable to distinguish the right from the wrong using the Golden Rule as the parameter. This is not the case in Islam. Right and wrong in Islam are based on what Muhammad said and did and not on what ethics dictate. For example, ethics dictate that beating women is wrong. In Islam it is halal to beat one's wife. According to ethics, punishment must

not exceed the crime; in Islam the punishment of a petty thief is chopping the hand. Islam also concerns itself with "sins of conscience". Ethics does not prescribe any punishment for such "sins". Individuals in ethical societies have the freedom of thought and actions. You are free to think, say and do what you please as long as you do not harm others. In Islam such freedom is inexistence. You would be punished and even brutally executed if you criticize Islam, apostatize, commit consensual, engage in sex out of marriage or have homosexual tendencies.

In Islam it is halal beat one's wife but it is haram for a woman to expose her hair to strangers. It is halal to be promiscuous and polygamous but the same is haram for women. It is halal to own slaves but it is haram to charge interest on loans. It is halal to deflower a 9 year old girl but it is haram for girls and boys to mingle. It is halal to rape a boy and have pedophilic relationship but it is haram to have homosexual relationship with another adult. Islamic Sharia is against human ethics. Morality in Islam is relative to what Sharia dictates and not to what logics or ethics say.

Historic and cultural moral relativity is a totally different issue. It is recognition that each culture and in each phase of the history, people had different code of moralities, distinct from ours.

What is Morality

Religious people believe that morality comes from religion and when religion loses its grip, people will become immoral. Is morality a product of religion? Are irreligious people immoral?

You said without religion people will start wife swapping. I had a conversation with a young Muslim who insisted if it were not for religion people would commit incest and nothing would stop them to sleep even with their own mothers. I asked him whether he personally lusted after his mother and whether Islam

was the only deterrent that stopped him from fornicating with her. He seemed insulted, but before he responded, I added if you are nauseated even by me mentioning such a thing, then realize that many others are just like you and feel and think the same way.

A big portion of our morality is part of our instinct. Incest for example is not condoned in any society whether religious or not. There are of course individuals with abnormal mental development who are exceptions to the norm. In fact, except for Bonobo chimps of Zair that rub their genitals together for social binding, no ape commits or procreates by incest. Usually the male individual visits other clans to find his mate. The young lions are forced to leave the pride to find mates in other prides while the lionesses stay.

Interestingly, marriages between children that grew-up together in one foster home are rare or non-existent, even though these kids are not related to each other by blood.

But some moral issues are not as clear as the above example. What is moral and immoral depends on time and culture. It may even vary from person to person. What was moral; say, a thousand years ago may be immoral today and vice versa. Also what is moral in one part of the world may not be so in others.

Take the example of promiscuity. Many cultures consider promiscuity to be immoral. Yet there are some cultures that accept it as the norm. To us, “western minded people”, having multiple sex partners simultaneously is considered promiscuity and immoral. Yet for a Muslim who practices polygamy, it is a “mercy of Allah”. In some parts of the world, women practice polyandry. Among the Inuit, a man would offer his wife to his guest to spend the night with, hoping that he may impregnate her. Which practice is immoral? And who is to determine it?

Is showing parts of your body immoral? In the heart of Amazon Jungle some tribes are completely nude. Is that

immoral? That is to them the way of life. In some Islamic countries women are required to cover every part of their body (like children playing ghost). Is that good morality? If that is the definition of morality are all those Muslim women who cover everything except their faces immoral? What about those who dress adequately yet do not use Hijab? Are they immoral? Now what about bikini wearing beach going women? Are they immoral? And finally, what about those who like to show it all in a nudist camp? Are THEY immoral? Your answer to this question depends on who you are and what is your own personal standard of morality.

Let us take another example: Slavery. Is slavery immoral? Slavery was practiced for centuries even by very pious people. Muhammad not only had slaves but he benefited from reducing free people into slaves and selling them. Was he immoral? If yes; why should we follow an immoral person and if no; why should we condemn its practice?

What about pedophilia? Obviously we all cringe at the thought of it and think that it is a shameful act of immorality. But during the time of the Prophet having sexual intercourse with a 9-year-old child was not immoral. In fact, Aisha's father, after a little bit of trepidation, consented to give her in marriage to Muhammad when Muhammad suggested it. At that time no one raised an eyebrow. The question is, if sleeping with a nine-year-old child was not deemed bad and therefore was not considered immoral, was it okay? Not everything that a society accepts as moral is right. Having sex with a minor may not have been immoral for Arabs 1400 years ago, but it is as it was then, unethical. Moralities are defined by circumstances, but ethics transcend time and space. They are rooted in logic. Morality can vary from culture to culture, from time to time and from person to person. Who is to determine what is moral and what is not?

A Man in Pakistan may think that if his wife meets her male-cousin with whom she has grown up without the presence of a third person she has committed an immoral act, has sullied his honor and the only way to restore his honor is to kill her. For him the meeting of two cousins is immoral but killing a human being is not.

We have to distinguish between those moralities that harm the society and those that do not. What harms others must be called unethical and discouraged. Slavery, for example, infringes upon the freedom of another human being. Therefore regardless of whether a society or a culture sanctions it, it is an unethical practice. 1400 years ago it was not immoral to have slaves. But slavery is ethically wrong and that transcends time Even the Prophet knew that slavery is wrong. That is why he advised his followers to manumit their slaves as an act of charity. Nonetheless he himself kept adding to his slaves by raiding city after city and capturing free people who were then reduced to slaves.

Interestingly because of what the prophet said, Muslims manumitted their slaves when they were old, could not work and needed care. Manumitting the slaves when they were young was an act of charity and moral but manumitting them at old age without provision was unethical. The Holy Prophet failed to mention that and the old slaves ended up as beggars in the streets while their masters gained the pleasure of Allah on one hand for manumitting them and exonerated themselves from having to take care of them in their old age on the other; thus killing two birds with one stone.

What would have been the right thing to do was not to take slaves in the first place. But the wealth of Muhammad and later on the Islamic rulers came from slave making and trading.

Hijab, no-hijab and even nudism does not have a material effect on anyone except the person who practices it. This is not

something that the society should intervene. It must be left to the individual to dress the way he or she deems appropriate. Imposing a dress code is infringing upon the human rights of the individual and restricting his or her freedom. It is unethical. Although I believe licensing nudism in the streets violates the rights of others who do not want to be shocked by exhibitionists, I have no objection for nudists to have a designated place to go and show off and get over it. As long as they do not rub it in my face, I have no right to impose my morality on them. I have no idea what makes nudists to take off their clothes, but if what they do does not materially affect me, it is none of my business.

Despite the Muslim's claim that laxity in dress code breeds violence quite the opposite is true. The same thing can be said about Hijab. This must be left to the individual. If a person likes to wear Hijab no one should stop her. But no state should enforce it on its citizens by law because that would be violating their freedom.

Now let me answer your concern about wife swapping. Well, that is adultery, even though it is mutual and consensual. Your question is what an irreligious society should do in this regard. My answer is the same as Pierre Trudeau gave in the Canadian Parliament. He said, "*The State has no place in the bedrooms of the people*". He delivered that speech more than 30 years ago and the Canadian government took that recommendation to heart. However, I do not see my fellow countrymen offering their wives to each other.

Frankly, it is none of my business what my neighbors do. As Muslims say, I am not going to be buried with them. Why you and I should even be talking about it?

Now look at Islamic countries where state regulates the private lives of its subjects. Single mothers are stoned to death in the most horrendous way. Is that moral? People are flagellated

for drinking bear. Women are beaten and bloodied because their scarves slipped and some of their hair became visible in the public. Tell me please which morality is more evil?

In final accounts, we must distinguish between what is immoral and what is unethical. Moral issues should be left to the individuals; ethical issues must be taught in schools and be enforced by law or code of ethics. Is promiscuity immoral or is it unethical? The answer to the first part of this question depends on who you are. If you belong to the “ultra” liberal faction of the western society or if you are a practicing Muslim, it may not be immoral for you to have multiple sex partners. But if you are an average westerner, you may think it is immoral. This is a matter of taste, culture and upbringing. We should not be concerned about the morality of this question. What consenting adults do in their bedrooms is none of our business. The question is whether it is ethical.

If promiscuity is institutionalized i.e. polygamy, is it still immoral? Those who practice it may not think that way but it certainly is unethical. Marriage is a social institution that affects more than those who make the vow. Not only children are affected but the whole society that would eventually have to take the tab to support such families that turn up to be dysfunctional will also be affected. The society has to pay for the education of the kids, their food and clothing as well as suffer the consequences of dealing with misfit individuals that would most likely result from such dysfunctional and highly patriarchal families. Polygamy must be outlawed not for its immorality, that as we said is a personal matter, but because it is unethical. It harms the children and it harms the society.

What is moral is fuzzy. Religious morality does not seem ethical any more. And what we consider to be moral is not so for religions. Polygamy, slavery, animal sacrifice, marriage with the

minors, etc are not immoral in Islam. But it is immoral for women to travel alone, not wear hijab or enter in an elevator alone with a stranger.

Therefore morality should definitely be left to the individual's discretion as it is subject to change. But what is ethical is well defined. Ethical values are driven from logic and the Golden Rule. They are universal and not subject to change In a nutshell, what hurts other people and violates their rights is unethical. In fact, even animals have rights that an ethical society must protect and respect.

The religious morality is the morality of the ancient man. Patriarchal societies imposed codes of moralities on women that would give men more control on their wives. Religious morality is not divinely ordained. It reflects the fears and the possessiveness of the men who made them. Islam imposes Hijab. Has this anything to do with Muhammad's worries as an aging man to control his numerous beautiful wives and protect them from being seen by young men whom he feared as rivals? He constantly kept emphasizing the importance of obeying one's husband. Did this have anything to do with the fact that most of his wives were teenagers and as such rebellious that he needed to control?

Morality is something personal and something that parents should teach to their children. But the true morality is not derived from antiquated doctrines and old beliefs. It is sad that some have made morality a hostage to religion. It is absurd to impose the morality of bygone cultures and vanquished worlds on our modern society. Morality is derived from human consciousness and our spiritual awareness. The more we mature the more sanctified becomes our acts. We won't have to live a moral life for the greed of a reward or the fear of punishment in the afterlife. We will be moral because it enhances our lives.

Morality should be part of who we are, just as our knowledge is part of who we are. The true morality is never in contrast with ethics.

Ethics has little to do with religion. As Gandhi said, ethics is the matter of economics. The question is where to invest our vital energy for a higher yield. If you invest your energy into sensual pleasures, you will get a temporary gratification. If you invest it in more meaningful things, you will get greater satisfaction.

Leading a moral life is not about renouncing pleasure. A life that is not gratifying is not worth living. It is about choices. What do we choose for pleasure? That is the question. One who invests his energy in the service of humanity gets more satisfaction than the one who indulges in the pursuit of worldly pleasures.

But this is a personal choice, derived from maturity and spiritual understanding. Morality should not be imposed by a higher authority such as state or religion. An imposed morality is not morality. One who leads a moral life for the fear of hell is not a moral person because he has not made his choices freely. Fear and greed, the traditional contrivances of religions, used as incentives to force people into accepting their morality do not make the society moral. No one and no religion should impose its morality on people. The imposition of morality is unethical. Religions that threaten their followers with the hellfire or lure them with the promises of paradise do not make them moral. Stick and carrot have better results in training animals than educating people. Only the person who chooses the higher road freely can be called a moral person.

A moral person chooses to live morally because it gives him immense pleasure. One who is honest takes pleasure in being honest. He would prefer to be tortured than to lie or to deceive. Our morality is directly linked to our spiritual maturity. When we evolve spiritually, service to humanity and working for peace

gratify us more than indulging in sensual pleasures. Nothing is wrong with sensual pleasures. But we get more pleasure in doing something in the service of humanity than gratifying our senses temporarily.

Would a person who loves knowledge require further incentive to learn than learning itself? Would Einstein, e.g. have delighted more in his scientific discoveries if someone had promised him a new car if he could write the theory of relativity? You may promise a child an ice cream if he did his homework, but that would not be necessary for an adult who seeks knowledge and finds his satisfaction in learning.

Primitive religions treat you like children (if not animals). They want to impose their outdated morality on you by threatening you with hell and bribing you with heaven to accept their antiquated and often unethical morality. Whether you are moral because of this fear and greed or because you find satisfaction in leading a moral life, depends on your maturity and spiritual awareness

The religious morality is not divinely ordained. It is the morality of the ancient people, their sages and (in the case of Islam) their charlatans. We do not need the morality of the ancient man just as we do not need his technology, science or medicine. The morality of the ancient man must be buried with his bones. Modern humans must chart their own morality. Morality must evolve just as human knowledge and his awareness evolves.

New morality does not mean immorality. It means coming out of the dark ages of ignorance and raising new generations that are responsible. Humans can no more be chained with foolish fears and threats of the afterlife. Science has shed light on the absurdity of religious concepts and shaken the foundation of the beliefs that our forefathers hold so sacrosanct. The manacles of

obscurantism are broken forever. Today we have to raise our kids with awareness. They must learn that mankind is One. Just as our parents taught us the religious lies and we believed, we can teach our children the truth and they will believe. The following is one such truth.

“All human beings are limbs of the same body. God created them from the same essence. If one part of the body suffers pain, then the whole body is affected. If you are indifferent to this pain, you cannot be called a human being”. - Sadi

We do not need to lie and frighten our children with hellfire to raise them moral, loving and good people. That has never worked. The history of inhumanity of mankind and especially that of the standard bearers of religions stand witness to this claim.

If we love our children, they learn to be ‘loving’. If we are honest, moral and ethical, they learn that too. We can build a better humanity by acting humanely today. But first we have to teach them love.

Compare the words of Sadi to the words of Muhammad, who said, *“Only Muslims are brothers to each other”* and as for the disbelievers:

“Fight them and Allah will punish them by your hands, cover them with shame, help you (to victory) over them, heal the breasts of Believers” [9:14]

As you see, my friend, the very belief in Islam is unethical and immoral. We cannot heal mankind until we do not remove its cancer. This cancer has reached a point that is going to kill us all. It is either the Humanity or Islam. Mankind will not have a future as long as this disease is left untreated. Islam must be eradicated now. Tomorrow it is too late.

What about other religions:

I am aware that many people are hooked to religion and life to them without the belief in a personal God and the promise of an afterlife is dreadful. I want to emphasize that my battle is not against religion as a whole. I noticed that you made that connection and claimed that rejecting Islam implies rejecting all other religions, God and eventually the morality. Not so! I am not a religious person and do not need a religion to live an ethical and meaningful life. I believe my life is quite meaningful and my efforts to bring humanity together and pave the road to peace by removing the biggest hurdle in the road to peace (Islam) is the greatest service one can render to mankind. (I only have to figure out how to pay my bills while I am doing this :- ()

However many people need religion and I respect that. My fight is against Islam only, not because it is a religion but because it IS NOT. Islam is politics in the garb of religion. It is an instrument of domination and subjugation. It only uses religious mask to penetrate and conquer.

After this billion people you are talking about leave Islam, they will have the choice to choose any of the existing religions or like me, no religion at all. So please do not panic. The vacuum left by Islam will be filled rapidly as we have enough religions and philosophies to take its place. Many Muslims have already left Islam and they will tell you that they are happier now than ever.

When Islam is dead, a doctrine of hate is dead. It is like removing a cancer. This means freedom for the present day Muslims and a chance to love the rest of mankind. They will be free to embrace their brothers and sisters in Humanity in amity and love. No more 'Ummah vs. unbelievers'. No more 'House of Islam vs. House of war'. No more 'Us vs. them'.

It would be the birth of Humanity as One. We will be One Humanity, One People, sharing One Planet. The ONLY planet!

There is nothing else out there that can sustain us. This tiny planet, this little blue jewel churning in the dark empty and cold space, is the only home we have. Let us not blow it up for a lie.

If you HAVE to follow a religion, why follow a religion of hate?

Your brother in Humanity,

Ali Sina.

Dear reader, if these words have struck a chord in you, please let others know too. Spread this message as far and as wide as you can. It is now up to us - yes you and me - the little people of this world, to save it. Do not falter. This is your calling. The clock is ticking and time is running out. This bomb of hate must be defused or the End will be much closer than you may anticipate.

Part III

Rape 1

Nov 20, 2003

From **Raheel Shahzad** to **Ali Sina** :

Now let me address some of the additional responses you had:

You wrote: *“For the next court session, I invite you to refute my charge against Muhammad being a lecherous womanizer. I contend that considering his lack of moral fortitude Muhammad could not be a messenger of God. He was simply a successful and ruthless cult leader who beguiled the foolhardy ignorant people of his time to satisfy his own ambitions and lusts”.*

This is a matter of interpretation which actually is the core of this entire case, so I think stating the conclusion before intelligently having made your case very clear and not based on a handful of simplistic articles here and there, or based on very limited materials even rejected by most Muslims, is not entirely appealing. We will obviously address your charges one by one, won't we?

You wrote: *"In the following links I have presented my claim with enough evidence to back it up.*

- *Juwairiyah*
 - *Safiyah: the Jewish wife of Muhammad*
 - *Adoption in Islam and Muhammad's Marriage to Zainab Bint Jahsh.*
 - *Mariyah The Coptic Sex Slave of the Prophet*
 - *Propaganda from an apologist: a straight reply*
- Please read all of them".*

I did. Marrying multiple times in our environment today is absolutely a problematic moral, and a vast majority of Muslims do not practice it. They have the commonsense to decipher what needs to be followed and what just cannot be replicated in today's society. Most of the advancing Islamic nations do not sanction slavery. America abolished it 140 years ago, even though it existed and was practiced by Christians. The consequences of that are being felt by African Americans today, but it will take time for racism from USA to go away completely. Morality shifted. So did it in Islam. And Muslims are capable of recognizing that. So instead of apologizing (as the 5th article above), I undoubtedly agree that the prophet married 12 times, and maybe more as some other "scholars" may find in some obscure sources. And he married a slave too, maybe more than one. Thomas Jefferson had slaves yet is revered. I suspect all

founding fathers of USA had slaves. So what can we do today? Now one may argue that a prophet is above marrying more than once, because Jefferson and Washington did not claim to be prophets, hence the prophet should have shown a stronger moral fortitude. My question then is, why? Has it been established somewhere that marrying multiple times 1400 years ago was somehow immoral?? Says who? Was keeping slaves immoral 1400 years ago? Says who? Was slavery viewed 200 years ago in USA as an immoral or evil act? Where is it documented that most people hid their slaves in undergrounds? It was a generally accepted practice, and people displayed the moral fortitude of their time. Were the prophets and Jefferson and Washington supposed to be knowledgeable about moral fortitude of 2003? Where is THAT documented? I want to read about their ability to foretell the future. Does Quran say anywhere "In 2003, the morals will be that you will view multiple wives as morally correct". And where is it documented that multiple wives was an extraordinary measure employed by very few men hence making it immoral in some way back then for the prophet to have done it. If Mormons in Utah today want to marry 4 women, are they morally wrong? Hence, if Muhammad married 12 women, or 35 women, or 400 women, he was displaying the normal fortitude of his time. Where are the articles that somehow make Mecca and Medina the centers of current day morals about marriage? No apologies absolutely. Muhammad married many women and you can pick any number you wish. The number is not of concern. He displayed moral fortitude of this time in relationship to multiple marriages and married some slave girl too. So the point of multiple marriages and to slaves is???

Even if you brought 13000 articles of his multiple marriages, what is that supposed to prove? I just stated without any apology that he married multiple times and to some slave girls and kept with the normal code of his time, and vast majority of Muslim

men do not marry multiple times today because of moral and societal shifting as it relates to married life.

Following Sunnah does not equal marrying 12 wives exactly by all Muslim men. In fact, if one has to stretch it, the Muslim men can only keep 4 women at a time (according to Quran) which precludes then the desire of Muslim men to emulate the prophet. Hence, this is a sunnah which actually cannot be practiced even if a Muslim wants to do it.

Commonsense is employed by most Muslim men in this regard, and so is employed by most Muslim women who will not agree to be the 9th wife of some mullah dude, no matter how closely following Sunnah he may declare himself. Many urban Muslim women in countries like Pakistan today will beat the Muslim guy out cold if he went around emulating 12 marriages and kept slaves.

Your insistence that Muhammad married multiple times then only proves one thing, that he married multiple times and had slaves. You want to bring him back in 2003 and force the moral fortitude onto him, and that's unfair to not only the prophet, but to all the founding fathers of USA (which gives the freedom of religion in the first place for us to even discuss this in an open environment)

You wrote: *“P.S. I do not want to sound triumphalist as I know this is one of the "virtues" of Muslims. However judging by your poor performance in this first round I invite you to gang up with other Muslims and build up a stronger defense”.*

I also am not triumphant at all. The case has not been concluded by either side, so I ask for patience in declaring triumph.

You wrote: *“I invite any other Muslim who wants to join the defense team and salvage the lost honor of their prophet to pitch in”.*

Yes if other intellectual Muslims want to join in, I would feel delighted too. I request that those Quran-thumping, irrational, narrow minded, blind, and morally unfit Muslims please refrain from joining in. If there's an intellectual and spiritually uplifting aspect to this and makes some reasonable sense even though it can be argued by some, then yes please join in. Love and compassion, as I said, should not be monopolized by non-Muslims only :)

You wrote: *“If you are a Muslim who are dismayed and think someone else can do better a job than Mr. Shahzad, please invite him. Tell him it is vital because the honor of Islam is at stake”.*

I disagree that the honor of Islam is at stake. Who is staking the honor? FFI? In that regard yes I agree that it might be challenged here, but as a religion on the whole, I doubt Islam's honor is at stake. But since I also came to this site to learn some more about the world, I really would like someone to do a better job than me, but please let me know first what groundbreaking revelation will be employed. Because if there's none, I can suffice myself here using the same sources that anyone else will use, and employing the same commonsense and style that is used to further the mission.

You wrote: *“I hereby promise once again; should anyone prove my charges against Muhammad to be false. I will not only withdraw this site but also will appear in any television and radio and announce to the world that I was wrong and Islam is true”.*

You may have set yourself up for triumph before the case actually is fully made, by virtue of having made up your mind about guilt. Hence, any refutation, no matter how logical or strong, will be rejected on grounds of being not absolute, which will each time yield you the same result, namely your triumph. So in this regard, I sincerely request you to be honest with

yourself, just based on your own moral code. Ignore me as a Muslim, I am saying personally on a fellow human level that you espoused honesty, so certainly in your mind if that is not tugging at your conscience, then we're both ok.

So, as a matter of fact, I will ask you to yield the following:

1- Do you agree that employing the logic of injecting marriage morals of 2003 and then writing articles to discount and debase the multi-marriage practice of ancient Arabia is a stretch?

2- Do you agree that in terms of moral fortitude in regards to marriage, that fortitude is to be judged based on the time and place in history?

3- Do you agree that the abolishing of slavery in America and its non-practice in many advancing nations today is a moral shift due to passage of time?

4- Do you agree that by the prophet marrying many times, he did not violate a moral norm of his time and today 12 marriages by Muslim men is probably only practiced in the remotest mountain villages?

5- Do you agree that marrying a slave may have had no moral or societal consequences 1400 years ago but today the moral code of marrying and keeping slaves is a societal shift seen in most Muslims nations?

In above I am not arguing the ages of the wives, because the issue of Ayesha's age is for a separate discussion, so I do not want to muddle this multiple marriage issue by using that. Hence I request not to jump at that. I am shedding light on circumstances of the multiple marriages. If a slave was married after a war ended, I am including that here that in reference to societal norm 1400 years ago, which I have admitted will seem quite strange in today's environment, hence I do not hear about slaves being married after a battle in today's world. Moral shift, not a change of religion.

So, I've been honest in my perspective, Mr. Sina, on issues of multiple marriages. I can from my own experiences insist that 12-15 marriages by Muslim men is just not happening today, and if someone is doing it, then it is the exception, not the norm among Muslim men of most advancing nations. Further, I cannot imagine marrying 10 women myself today coz I'll just go plain nuts tending to them. So in this context, yes if the prophets married multiple times, it is no compulsion on me to emulate THAT aspect today, and I am part of the vast majority of Muslim men who will agree with me on this. The Ahle-Sunnat themselves can attest that they are just not emulating this aspect at all and we all agree that the prophet married many times and kept slaves, based on the norms of his society and times. So if the Ummah has got with the program, why the insistence that we should all somehow ridicule the prophet for his marriages today. That's not to say that everything else is hunky dory, but as far as multiple marriages of the prophet go and him marrying a slave, we really just really do not emulate that. It's not an apology but a statement of fact. The prophet married many women and some were slaves and that's all there is to it. I really then do not want to read a gazillion articles on it, even though I have most on this site. No matter how many I read, the bottomland implication or accusation is the same: He married x lady and he's not morally fit.

And I think at the end of each article. .."Ok so what?"... He married many women and had slaves. So I should convert to atheism today because Muhammad as a human being married multiple times? An immense ideological and logical stretch for me at least.

In my next response, I shall write on the age of wives and then maybe tackle the issue of Quran, which the defendant is being accused having concocted single handedly, as a team, or maybe Satan was responsible. Either way, I shall ask some

straightforward questions of the prosecutor and hope to learn more.

You wrote: *“There are over a billion Muslims in this planet. Is there not just one who can prove me wrong?”*

Well, that also is a matter of perspective. If one truly wants to be proven wrong will all the goodness of their heart and really prescribes to high morals and knows how to keep things within perspective and context, then yes plenty will have some intellectually appealing aspect for you. But if a mind is made up about a certain aspect, a predetermined outcome is envisioned, then I will concede that there's not a single living human today or ever in future who you will find capable of proving you wrong. I call this the circular motion logic based on some poster I once saw. It went something like this:

Rule 1- I am always Right

Rule 2- If I am ever wrong, please see Rule #1

I myself do not subscribe to this logic because there's a lot that I can challenge and there's a lot I can learn and adjust. Of course, all aspects of faith to me are not black/white things. There's a lot involved. So to me, confidence and stubbornness are two different things.

You wrote: *“Even the hypocrite and the paid western apologists of Islam are welcome to join the defense. Please tell your Saudi sponsors to fill up your bank accounts again as you are going to defend Islam once more and shut down this pesky site that has brought so much humiliation and disgrace to the religion of Allah and his messenger”*

Alas! I can only hope. But in seriousness, I don't know how this all works dude. I'm presenting a response to you as a Muslim guy who has learned a lot and has thought about faith and has come to realize that Islam itself or any religion is not the

problem; it is the handful of practitioners and those pesky jihadi followers of theirs that are the bad seed. Maybe some governments too, but those dictators are following their own style of religion, which MAY be called Islam, but I just don't know what that religion can be called. I saw Saddam praying in a TV news item once. I cringed and then thought... Wait, who and what is he praying to? And what exactly is he asking for? cos to him being a Muslim was probably not the burning desire, but power certainly was.. So he prayed to something for even more power.

Don't know if anyone was really listening.

Thank you.

From **Ali Sina** to **Rahee Shahzad**

Dear Mr. Shahzad,

I am afraid you either did not read the articles on the wives of Muhammad or you missed the point completely.

Your whole argument was about multiple marriages and why in your opinion it is irrelevant because the Muslims generally do not marry more than one wife at the time.

The problem I presented is far more complex than the fact that Muhammad had a lot of women. The problem is that he raided innocent civilians with no warning, killed the men and then chose the prettiest women for himself and had sex with them on the same day he killed their husbands, fathers and loved ones. This is the case of Juwairiyah, Rayhanah and Safiyah. The stories of these women are extremely revealing as much as they are disturbing.

I will narrate the stories of Juwairiyah and Safiyah in this part. About Rayhanah there is little detail available.

All we know is that she was a member of the Jewish tribe Bani Qurayza. Muhammad surrounded that town and shut the flow of water to them. They had to surrender and then he ordered all the men to be beheaded, their belongings confiscated and their wives and children sold as slaves.

Rayhanah was the most beautiful woman of this tribe. She became the sex slave of Muhammad. She refused marrying the mass murderer of his people. However, she had to accept the humiliation of being raped by her captor, the messenger of Allah.

There is more documentation available about Juwairiyah and Safiyah and the details of their capture and rape are shocking.

In continuation we will read their tale and your job, should you decide to continue as the defense attorney, is to justify the actions of Muhammad and acquit him of the charge of rape.

These stories also contain evidence of the Prophet committing war crimes, treachery, plundering, slavery and utmost cruelty. However we will talk about these other charges in another time when I will present more horrendous evidence to back my claims.

Juwairiyah (by Ali Sina)

In the history of the Arabs that predates the arrival of Islam, never before had there been such wars, certainly none on the scale and magnitude of those that were instigated by Muhammad the founder of Islam. Previous battles in Arabia had mainly centered on tribal differences and were confined to bouts of squabbling with some fights. With the introduction of Islam came not only war, but also an unrelenting genocide and terror that would quickly become integral components in furthering Islam's expansionism.

The early years of Muhammad's prophetic career, in his native town Mecca, were peaceful. After 13 years of preaching no

more than 70 or 80 people had embraced his cause. Not all of them were able fighting men. That explains why those early years were peaceful. Muslims did not have the strength to fight. However soon after Muhammad migrated and settled in Medina, and the Arab population of that town accepted his religion, he began invading and looting first the merchant caravans and then the human settlements to survive and to provide for his followers who had accompanied him and because of their lack of expertise had a difficult time finding employments in Medina.

The fifth year of Hijrah (migration to Medina) was an eventful year. That was the year that Muslims fought the famous war of the ditch against the Meccans and soon after that they surrounded the Jewish quarter of Bani Qaynuqa of Medina who were a prosperous population of goldsmiths and blacksmiths and after confiscating their properties (vineyards and homes) and belongings (jewelry and arms) they were banished from their ancestral home. After that he set his sight on another Jewish tribe, the Bani Nadir. He did a similar thing to them. He killed their leaders and many of their able-bodied men and after confiscating their properties and much of their wealth, expelled the rest from Medina. In neither of these cases the Jews offered any resistance. They were taken by surprise and simply surrendered under the superior forces of Muhammad's men.

Emboldened by his victories over these weaker, non-combative and non-threatening people who agreed to give up their wealth in exchange for their lives and goaded by an insatiable greed and his lust for power this self styled messenger of Allah then set his eyes upon other Jewish tribes of Arabia living outside of Medina. This time it was the turn of Bani al-Mustaliq.

Bukhari, the great biographer of Muhammad, narrates the attack on Bani al-Mustaliq in the following story (Hadith)

Narrated Ibn Aun: *“I wrote a letter to Nafi and Nafi wrote in reply to my letter that the Prophet had suddenly attacked Bani Mustaliq without warning while they were heedless and their cattle were being watered at the places of water. Their fighting men were killed and their women and children were taken as captives; the Prophet got Juwairiya on that day. Nafi said that Ibn Umar had told him the above narration and that Ibn 'Umar was in that army.”* [Volume 3, Book 46, Number 717]

This same Hadith is recorded in the Sahih Muslim Book 019, Number 4292, which validates the claim of its authenticity.

Muhammad molded his religion after Judaism and had great expectations that the Jews would be the first to heed his call. Nevertheless, to his chagrin, the Jews had no interest in his religion and he never forgave them for that. You cannot reject a narcissist without invoking his rage. Muhammad was so upset that he changed the direction of the Qiblah (the direction towards which the Muslims pray) from Jerusalem to Kaaba, which at that time was just a temple of idols and said Allah transformed the Jews were transformed into apes and swine because of their transgression (Q. 5:60) and (Q. 2:65). Muhammad made the Jews the scapegoat to rally his followers around himself. He was an expert of that old trick known as “divide n’ conquer”. The Arabs of Medina were generally a bunch of illiterate folk with little skills and often poor who made their living by working in the vineyards of the Jews and rendering other services to them. They were originally immigrants from Yemen while the Jews were the masters of trades and the owners of the lands who had called Medina home, for 2000 years. They were easy targets. Prowling their wealth and making more money by enslaving their women and children and distributing them among the poor Arabs while giving them the assurance that killing their masters and bread givers is not only ethical but also sanctioned by God proved a very lucrative enterprise for Muhammad, one that would change

his fortunes, and set this new religion on its eventual path of war and military conquests.

Muhammad sent one of his companions; Bareeda bin Haseeb, to spy on the Bani al-Mustaliq and after assessing the situation he ordered his men to attack. Muslims came out of Madina on 2nd Shaban of 5 A.H. and encamped at Muraisa, a place at a distance of 9 marches from Medina.

The following quote from an Islamic site states:

"The news of the advance of Muslim forces had already reached Haris. In panic, his men deserted him and he himself took refuge in some unknown place. But the local population of Muraisa took up arms against the Muslims and rained showers of arrows in a sustained manner. The Muslims launched a sudden and furious attack and routed the enemy, who suffered huge casualties and nearly 600 were taken prisoners by the Muslims. Among the booty there were 2,000 camels and 5,000 goats. The prisoners of war included Barra, the daughter of Haris, who later on became Hazrat Juwairiyah, the consort of the Holy Prophet. According to the prevailing practice all the prisoners were made slaves and distributed among the victorious Muslim soldiers. Hazrat Juwairiyah fell to the lot of Thabit bin Qais. She was the daughter of the leader of the clan, and therefore, very much felt the discomfiture and disgrace of being made slave of an ordinary Muslim soldier. Therefore, she requested him to release her on payment of ransom. Thabit agreed to this, if she could pay him 9 Auqias of gold. Hazrat Juwairiyah had no ready money with her. She tried to raise this amount through contributions, and approached the Holy Prophet also in this connection. She said to him "O' Prophet of Allah! I am the daughter of Al Haris bin Zarar, the Lord (chief) of his people. You know that it is by chance that our people have fallen captive and I have fallen to

the share of Thabit bin Qais and have requested him to release me considering my status, but he has refused. Please do an act of kindness and save me from humiliation". The Holy Prophet was moved and asked the captive woman if she would like a thing still better. She asked as to what was that thing. He said that he was ready to pay her ransom and marry her if she liked. She agreed to this proposal. So the Holy Prophet (sallal alaho alahie wasallam) paid the amount of ransom and married her." www.trueteachings.com

The above is the story how Muhammad married Juwairiyah as recorded by Muslim historians. Interestingly Muhammad makes his Allah praise him with verses such as the following: "*And surely thou hast sublime morals*" (Quran 68:4). And "*Indeed in the Messenger of Allah you have a good example to follow*" (Quran 33:21) The question that begs an answer is; was he really the standard of sublime morals and good example to follow?

First he attacks a population without warning and only because they were easy targets and wealthy. As usual he kills the unarmed able-bodied men, plunders their belongings, then enslaves the rest. Is this behavior befitting of a messenger of God? The narrator says, "*According to the prevailing practice all the prisoners were made slaves and distributed among the victorious Muslim soldiers.*" As we read the history of Islam, we see this WAS indeed the prevailing practice of the Muslim Mujahedin, throughout the bloody history of Islam. Yet the question remains unanswered. Is this how a messenger of God should behave? In another place Muhammad called himself the mercy of God for all the worlds 21:107. What is the difference between this "mercy of God" and a ruthless marauding gangster and a tyrant? If Muhammad were not the "mercy of God" and if he were not "*a good example to follow*", how else would he have then behaved?

If this was the prevailing practice of the Arabs, couldn't the messenger of God change it? Why engage in such a barbaric practice at all? Did he not say that his is the example to follow? Why should a man with such a claim behave in so brutal a fashion? Was he merely following the customs of his people or was he attempting to set an example for them to follow?

It is very clear that Muhammad was not "moved" by compassion but by lust. Muhammad did not set free Juwairiyah because he felt sorry for her. He was a man incapable of such feelings. He wanted Juwairiyah for himself. And this is the man 1.2 billion people follow as the perfect example and a messenger of God.

Unlike what most people may think, Muhammad's intentions were not to convert people to his religion. His real aim was power, wealth and domination. Religion was just the pretext he used to subdue and conquer those he first sought to have dominion over. He weighed each case differently and considered its financial benefits. In most cases it was more profitable if the people did not convert to Islam, but killed and their belongings taken as spoils of war and their wives and children enslaved and soled with huge profits. This could bring sudden wealth to this "messenger of God" that otherwise he could not have. If people were given the choice they could have feared defeat and the harsh consequences and they could have accepted Islam. This would have impeded Muslims of looting them, which meant loss of profit. That is why Muhammad did not deem appropriate to warn the Bani Mustaliq just as he never warned his other victims but attacked them by surprise.

Muslim, another biographer of Muhammad, narrates:

Ibn Aun reported: *I wrote to Nafi' inquiring from him whether it was necessary to extend (to the disbelievers) an invitation to accept (Islam) before meeting them in fight. He wrote (in reply)*

to me that it was necessary in the early days of Islam. The Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) made a raid upon Banu Mustaliq while they were unaware and their cattle were having a drink at the water. He killed those who fought and imprisoned others. On that very day, he captured Juwairiya bint al-Harith. Nafi' said that this tradition was related to him by Abdullah b. Umar who (himself) was among the raiding troops." [Book 019, Number 4292]

Muslim warriors carried on this Sunnah (examples set by Muhammad) after his death.

When a Muslim army invaded a town, they would not allow anyone to convert to Islam for three days. During these three days they could kill as many men as they liked, pillage their properties, then rape and enslave their women and children. Only after a town had been decimated and all the young women and children that could be sold as slaves were captured would the brutal campaign of Islamization, with its brutal mandate that all must convert or die, began. However the Jews and the Christians were given protection to live provided they pay a penalty tax called Jizyah and enter into dhimmitude. Dhimmi means protected. But the dhimmis had to pay a hefty jizyah for their protection. This Jizyah was the source of livelihood of the Muslims who through it were able to live like parasites off the labor of the dhimmis. The following Hadith, reported by Bukhari, records the source for this practice based on the admonitions of Muhammad toward the dhimmi:

Narrated Juwairiya bin Qudama At-Tamimi: *We said to 'Umar bin Al-Khattab, oh Chief of the believers! Advise us."* He said, *"I advise you to fulfill Allah's Convention (made with the Dhimmis) as it is the convention of your Prophet and **the source of the livelihood of your dependents** (i.e. the taxes from the Dhimmis.)"* Volume 4, Book 53, Number 388:

Continuing the story of Juwairiyah, Aisha who accompanied the prophet on this expedition related:

*"When the prophet-peace be upon him- distributed the captives of Banu Almustaliq, she (Barrah) fell to the lot of Thabit ibn Qyas. She was married to her cousin, who was killed during the battle. She gave Thabit a deed, agreeing to pay him nine okes of gold for her freedom. **She was a very beautiful woman. She captivated every man who saw her.** She came to the prophet-peace be upon him-, to ask for his help in the matter. **As soon as I saw her at door of my room, I took a dislike to her, for I knew that he would see her as I saw her.** She went in and told him who she was, the daughter of al-Harith ibn Dhirar, the chief of his people. She said: 'you can see the state to which I have been brought. I have fallen to the lot of Thabit, and have given him a deed for ransom, and I have to come to ask your help in the matter.' He said: 'would you like something better than that? I will discharge your debt, and marry you.' she said: 'yes. O then it is messenger of Allah! Done.' he replied."*

This story ends any further arguments about to the real motives of Muhammad in marrying only the young and beautiful women. As it can be seen Muhammad murders the husband of Juwairiyah, who was also her cousin. Captivated by her beauty, he offers to free her, but only on the condition she marries him. After having come to Muhammad to plead for his help, this self declared Messenger of God, this self proclaimed "mercy of God for humanity", this self styled "example to follow" by all the Muslims presents her with a most unwelcome choice, for whose price is that she must surrender her freedom. What other choice could there possibly be for her? Muslims apologetics insists that most of Muhammad's wives were widows. They try to give the impression Muhammad married them as an act of charity. However as it becomes clear these women were young and beautiful. If they were widows, is because Muhammad murdered

their husbands. Juwairiyah was just 20 years old then while Muhammad was 58.

Interestingly, the name of Juwairiyah was originally Barra (Pious). Apparently Muhammad did not like this name and so changed her name to Juwairiyah. Even the two Zeinabs who were his wives were previously called Barra and he changed their names as well to Zeinab, It would appear the Prophet had some guilt in becoming sexually intimate with women that were called "Pious". These seemingly incidental incidents reflect a certain hitherto humanity, a conscience, if you will, to his character, and perhaps hint at his own real, but hidden religiosity. Muhammad was certainly convinced of his own cause. However his understanding of reality was distorted as he had difficulty to distinguish between what is real and what is imagined. In fact, Muhammad was more motivated by fear and superstitions than by conscience and ethics.

The rest of the story of Juwairiyah is mixed with half-truths and exaggerations, in the manner that have tainted most of the Hadiths. We read:

"It is said that when the Prophet -peace be upon him- departed from the raid with Juwairiyah and was at Dhuljaysh, he entrusted her to one of the Ansar and went forward to Madinah. Her father, al-Harith, discovered that she was held captive and went back o Madinah, bringing his daughter's ransom. When he reached al-Aqia, he looked at the camels he had brought as her ransom and admired the two of them greatly, so he hid them in one of the passes of al-Aqia. Then he came to the Prophet-peace be upon him- dragging the camels behind him, and told him: "My daughter is too noble to be taken as a captive. Set her free by this ransom." the Prophet-peace be upon him- replied: "Isn't it better that we let her choose herself?" that is fair enough," said al-Harith. He came to his daughter and said: "This man is letting

you chose so do not dishonor us!" "I choose Allah's messenger," she replied calmly. "What a disgrace!" he exclaimed.

The Prophet -peace be upon him-, then said "where are two camels which you have hidden in al-Aqia in such -and- such a pass?" al-Harith exclaimed: "I bear witness that there is no God but Allah, and that you Muhammad are the messenger of Allah! For none could have known of this but Allah."

Ibn-i-Sad in his 'Tabaqat', states that the father of Juwairiyah paid her ransom amount, and when she became free, the Holy Prophet married her. As a result of this marriage all the prisoners of war numbering about 600 were freed by the Muslims as they did not like that any member of the family in which the holy Prophet was married, be made a slave."

It is hard to determine which part of these stories is true and which part is not. However, what is not so difficult to notice are the many contradictions contained within the main storyline. For instance, we read that Muhammad paid the ransom to Thabit the captor of Juwairiyah, and then married her after freeing her. Then we read that Harith, the father of Juwairiyah also paid the ransom to set her free. As to the claims of Muhammad having some sort of psychic power, that empowered him to know or tell certain things in advance, for instance knowing certain information such as the whereabouts of camels, we can safely conclude that these claims are false. On many occasions Muhammad demonstrated precisely the opposite, and proved that he was by no means psychic, let alone prescient, as he failed to discern or to obtain through divine blessings the information he so desired. For instance, when he raided Khaibar, he tortured the treasurer of that town, even to the point of death, just so he could extract from him the information that would lead to the whereabouts of the city's treasures.

It is important to understand the character of the Arab peoples. In this particular instance it was the Arabs who exhibited higher moral standards than their prophet. They

released the relatives of Juwairiyah after they learned that Muhammad had married her. Muhammed was devoid of common decency, of having or showing even a hint of the virtues reflective of a moral leader. Without any empathy for those whose misfortune it was to become his victim.

Muslims claim that Juwairiyah became a very devout believer and would spend all of her days praying. The source of this claim can be found in the book *Usud-ul-Ghaba*. There the author writes that whenever the Prophet used to come to Juwairiyah he would find her praying, then when he would return at a later time he still found her praying. One day he said to her: “Shall I tell you few words, if you say them they will be heavier in the scale than what you have done? You say: *'subhaana allahe 'adada khalqihi, subhana allahe ridhaa nafsehe, subhana allahe zinata 'arshehe, subhana allahe zinata 'arshehe, subhana allah midadda kalimaatihi.'* (Praise Allah as many times as number of his creatures, and as much as pleases him, and as much as the weight of his throne, and as much as the ink for his words).

One wonders why Muslims spend 5 times a day praying and waste that much man hours unproductively when they have such a simple and unbeatable formula to praise Allah.

Let us look at this situation from a more realistic perspective. Put yourself in the shoes of a young woman who has just fallen into the lot of a murderer of her husband who also happened to be her cousin! As relatives, they grew up together. They were more than just husband and wife. They were first playmates, then lovers and companions for life. If you were a woman in Juwairiya's situation, how would you feel about the killer of your husband and many of your relatives and loved ones? Suppose further you don't have anywhere to go to. Without any viable options for escape, your only choice would be to surrender as a sex slave to this old man, one who is the king of his people

and has plenty of money or to be given away to one of his soldiers. Under whose captivity would you rather be? I believe the answer is clear. Juwairiya had no choice but to accept Muhammad's offer to marry her. Now what would any woman do if such an old man as this came to her for sex or company? She probably would devise a survival ploy. That is what Juwairiyah did. Any time she noticed Muhammad is coming, she pretended that she was busy praying, hoping that he would leave her and go to his other wives to satisfy his wretched lust. Yet, as we see, Muhammad was a cunning old man. He soon prescribed a sentence and told her that this "will be heavier in the scale" than praying all day long, robbing her from excuses to shun him when he desired her.

Safiyah (By Ali Sina)

The following is the story of Safiyah Bint Huyeyi Ibn Akhtab, the Jewish woman who was captured when Muhammad's troops attacked Kheibar and brought her to the Prophet as part of his share of the booty. This story is reported in the Book of Tabaqat and is published also in the trusted Islamic site. <http://www.prophetmuhammed.org/> (This site seems to be shut down now. The story was published is several Islamic sites when I wrote this article, but now not a single site carries it. However the story can be traced from the hadith easily. I suspect soon all Islamic literature will be withdrawn from the site as more and more it becomes evident that they are far more damaging to the reputation of Islam than anything I can write)

Safiyah was seventeen and very beautiful when Muslims killed her father, husband and many of her relatives. In the same day the Prophet of Allah wanted to sleep with her. Here is the exact text of the story in **green**.

"Safiyah was born in Medinah. She belonged to the Jewish tribe of Banu 'I-Nadir. When this tribe was expelled from

Medinah in the year 4 A.H, Huyaiy was one of those who settled in the fertile colony of Khaibar together with Kinana ibn al-Rabi' to whom Safiyah was married a little before the Muslims attacked Khaibar. She was then seventeen. She had formerly been the wife of Sallam ibn Mishkam, who divorced her. One mile from Khaibar. Here the Prophet married Safiyah. She was groomed and made-up for the Prophet by Umm Sulaim, the mother of Anas ibn Malik. They spent the night there. Abu Ayyub al-Ansari guarded the tent of the Prophet the whole night. When, in the early dawn, the Prophet saw Abu Ayyub strolling up and down, he asked him what he meant by this sentry-go; he replied: "I was afraid for you with this young lady. You had killed her father, her husband and many of her relatives, and till recently she was an unbeliever. I was really afraid for you on her account". The Prophet prayed for Abu Ayyub al-Ansari (Ibn Hisham, p. 766) Safiyah had requested the Prophet to wait till he had gone a stage away from Khaibar. "Why?" asked the Prophet. "I was afraid for you on account of the Jews who still happened to be near at Khaibar!"

The reason Safiyah rejected the sexual advances of the 57-year-old Muhammad should be obvious to any objective person. I believe most women prefer to mourn than jump into bed with the killer of their father, husband and many relatives on the same day of their death. But the fact that the prophet of Allah could not contain his sexual urges for one day to let this young girl grieve, says a lot of his thinking and moral character. However as for the rest of the story we are not sure whether it is true or was fabricated by Muslim historians to wipe the impression of rape. But this is all we have and to find the truth we have to rely on these biased documents written by Muslim historians. The story goes on to say that Abu Ayyub was concerned for the safety of the prophet because he (Muhammad) had killed Safiyah's father, husband and many of her relatives. This is

logical. It is foolish to sleep with a woman after killing her loved ones. But Safiyah's excuse for rejecting Muhammad's advances towards her seems unreasonable. When Muhammad took this young girl into his tent, he had already killed many Jews and was winning the war. If there were any Jews left, they probably were more worried for their own lives than Safiyah's chastity. Also she was already in the tent alone with Muhammad, how the Jews would have known if they were engaged in sex or not? I wonder what other excuse could she make to a man who was the murderer of her father, husband and many of her relatives to let her alone at least that night?

“The next day a Walima (wedding-feast) was arranged on behalf of the Prophet...”

Note that the historian is saying that the wedding took place one day after the prophet got private with Safiyah and made his moves to have sex with her. This presented no problem for the prophet as he had his Allah reveal a verse saying it is okay to sleep with women captured in war without marrying them even if they are married.

*“And all married women (are forbidden unto you) **save those (captives) whom your right hands possess ...**” (Q. 4:24)*

The above verse shows that the Holy prophet did not believe that slaves have any right. You could be a happily married woman living your own life, but if Muhammad and his devout followers attacked your town and captured you, you would lose all your rights, and while your husband was being killed or enslaved you would be given to a Muslim Mujahid who would rape you all with Allah's blessings.

This is confirmed in another place.

(Q. 23: 1-7)

“1-The believers must (eventually) win through,-

- 2- Those who humble themselves in their prayers;
- 3-Who avoid vain talk;
- 4- Who are active in deeds of charity;
- 5- Who abstain from sex,
- 6- Except with those joined to them in the marriage bond, or (the captives) whom their right hands possess,- for (in their case) they are free from blame,
- 7- But those whose desires exceed those limits are transgressors”

Let us continue with the story of Safiyah.

“The other wives of the Prophet showed their jealousy by making slights upon her Jewish origin. But the Prophet always defended her. Once Safiyah was vexed to the extreme by the taunts of all the Arab wives of the Prophet, She took the complaint to the Prophet, who felt great compassion for her. He consoled her. He encouraged her. He equipped her with logic. He said: "Safiyah, take courage and be bold. They are in no way superior to you. Tell them: I am a daughter of the Prophet Harun, a niece of the Prophet Musa, and a wife of the Prophet Muhammad".

When she was brought along with other prisoners-of-war, the Prophet said to her, "Safiyah, your father always maintained enmity with me until Allah made the final decision." She said, "But Allah does not catch one for the sins of another."

This of course contradicts Muhammad’s own behavior, who annihilated the entire Bani Qainuqa with the pretext that few of them had killed a Muslim in retaliation. That is despite the verse that says *"Namely, that no bearer of burdens can bear the burden of another"* (Q. 53:38) Also it was not Allah who made the final decision. Safiyah's father was killed by Muhammad's men not by Allah. This would be the same as Hitler claiming that God killed

all the Jews in the holocaust. If God wanted to kill all those people that Muhammad and his army killed He could have done it on his own. God needs no mercenaries to do his will.

“The Prophet then gave her the choice of joining her people after freedom or accepting Islam and coming into a matrimonial relationship with him”

We have to remember that Muhammad killed most of her people and banished the rest of them. So giving the choice to join her people is not much of a choice.

“She was very intelligent and gentle and said, "O Allah's Messenger, I had hoped for Islam, and I confirmed you before your invitation. Now when I have the honour to be in your presence, I am given a choice between kufr and Islam I swear by Allah, that Allah and His Messenger is dearer to me than my own freedom and my joining with my people." (Tabaqat)

Was this confession, if true, sincere? Was she safe to speak out her mind? She was enslaved by a man who had exterminated her family and could do with her the same. See the reference made to her "freedom". This shows clearly that she was not free. In fact she must have been very intelligent to fabricate those lies to save her own life.

“When Safiyah was married, she was very young, and according to one report she was hardly seventeen years old and was extremely beautiful. Once Aisha said a few sentences about her short stature, at which the Prophet said, "You have said a thing that if it were left in the sea, it would mix with it (and make its water dirty)." (Abu Dawud). She not only deeply loved the Prophet but also greatly respected him as Allah's Messenger, for she heard the conversations of her father and uncle after they went to Medinah. When the Prophet migrated to Medinah, they came to see him and find out whether he was the true Messenger of Allah spoken of in the Scriptures. When they got back and

talked together that night, Safiyah was in her bed listening to them. One of them said, "What do you think about him?" He replied, "He is the same Prophet foretold by our Scriptures." Then the other said, "What is to be done?" The reply came that they must oppose him with all their might."

Is this story, narrated by Abu Dawud, credible? How can two Jews recognize Muhammad as the prophet foretold by their scriptures and decide to oppose him with all their might? It defies all logic. It takes a "deficient in intelligence" to believe in this nonsense. It is not clear whether Safiyah lied to conform and make herself accepted among her enemies or it is another fabrication of a zealot believer. Why would someone decide to oppose with all his might the one who he has found out to be the promised one of his own scriptures? But this is not all! Where in the Bible it says anything about Muhammad? How come Safiyah's father and uncle could decipher their scriptures and find about Muhammad while for 1400 years all Muslim scholars have been unable to do it?

"So Safiyah was convinced of the truth of the Prophet. She spared no pain to look after him, care for him and provide every comfort that she could think of. This is evident since she came into his presence after the fall of Khaibar."

See how the writer contradicts himself in one page? Just a few lines above, we read that she was captured and was taken to Muhammad as a prisoner. She didn't come on her own. She was taken to the prophet because she was young and the prettiest of other women captured.

"The Prophet had a slight grievance against her for she had refused when the Prophet wanted to have privacy with her at the previous stage (of the journey). At the next halt, the Prophet had privacy with her and spent all night with her. When she was asked by Umm Sulaim, "What did you see in Allah's Messenger?"

She said he was very pleased with her and did not sleep at all but was talking to her all night. He had asked her, 'Why did you refuse at the first stage when I desired privacy with you?' She had said, 'I was afraid for you because of the nearness of the Jews. "This thing further increased my merit in his eyes." (Tabaqat)

Bukhari also has recorded some Hadiths telling the invasion of Kheibar and how Muhammad met Safiyah.

“Narrated Abdul Aziz: Anas said, 'When Allah's Apostle invaded Khaibar, we offered the Fajr prayer there yearly in the morning) when it was still dark. The Prophet rode and Abu Talha rode too and I was riding behind Abu Talha. The Prophet passed through the lane of Khaibar quickly and my knee was touching the thigh of the Prophet. He uncovered his thigh and I saw the whiteness of the thigh of the Prophet. When he entered the town, he said, 'Allahu Akbar! Khaibar is ruined. Whenever we approach near a (hostile) nation (to fight) then evil will be the morning of those who have been warned.' He repeated this thrice. The people came out for their jobs and some of them said, 'Muhammad (has come).' (Some of our companions added, "With his army.") We conquered Khaibar, took the captives, and the booty was collected. Dihya came and said, 'O Allah's Prophet! Give me a slave girl from the captives.' The Prophet said, 'Go and take any slave girl.' He took Safiya bint Huyai. A man came to the Prophet and said, 'O Allah's Apostles! You gave Safiya bint Huyai to Dihya and she is the chief mistress of the tribes of Quraiza and An-Nadir and she befits none but you.' So the Prophet said, 'Bring him along with her.' So Dihya came with her and when the Prophet saw her, he said to Dihya, 'Take any slave girl other than her from the captives.' Anas added: The Prophet then manumitted her and married her.”

“Thabit asked Anas, "O Abu Hamza! What did the Prophet pay her (as Mahr)?" He said, "Herself was her Mahr for he

manumitted her and then married her." Anas added, "While on the way, Um Sulaim dressed her for marriage (ceremony) and at night she sent her as a bride to the Prophet." (Sahih Bukhari 1.367)

Mahr or dowry is money that a bride receives from her husband when he marries her. Muhammad did not pay Safiyah her Mahr because he had to pay it to himself for manumitting her. Of course the irony is that he did not buy her but enslaved her by raiding her town. This story is significant because it gives us an insight into the moral and ethical values of the Prophet of God (Peace be upon his immaculate soul).

Our modern sensibility makes us cringe with stories like this, yet amazingly Muhammad taught that he is going to receive two rewards by marrying Safiyah – one for manumitting someone whom no one but himself had enslaved and the other for marrying the prettiest girl who was 40 years younger.

"Abu Musa reported that Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) said about one who emancipated a slave woman, and then married her, that for him there are two rewards". (Sahih Muslim Book 008, Number 3327)

Also in another part

"Narrated Anas: The Prophet offered the Fajr Prayer near Khaibar when it was still dark and then said, "Allahu-Akbar! Khaibar is destroyed, for whenever we approach a (hostile) nation (to fight), then evil will be the morning for those who have been warned." Then the inhabitants of Khaibar came out running on the roads. The Prophet had their warriors killed, their offspring and woman taken as captives. Safiya was amongst the captives, She first came in the share of Dahya Alkali but later on she belonged to the Prophet. The Prophet made her manumission as her 'Mahr'. " (Sahih Bukhari V.5 B.59 N.512)

In this session, you posed a series of questions. I will try to answer them to the best of my ability.

1- I do not think that the morality of seventh century Arabs should be weighed by the moral standards of today.

2- I agree that the moral fortitude of a person should be judged with the morality of his contemporaries and his people.

3- I do agree that morality shifts and as I said in Part II of this debate, it is relative to time and place.

4- I did not say that by marrying a multitude of women Muhammad violated the moral code of his time. And yes polygamy today is not the norm among the majority of the Muslims.

5- Finally I do agree that sleeping with a slave girl 1400 years ago in Arabia was not considered immoral. And yes in "most" Islamic nation today such thing is not practiced.

So as you see I agreed with all your points. Nevertheless, I do not agree that these are good excuses to acquit your client.

The point that you missed is that Muhammad claimed to be a prophet of God for all times and for all the Humanity. He declared himself to be the last prophet and the best of the creation. He stated that he had "sublime morals" 68:4, that he is a "good example to follow" 33:21, "a Mercy for all creatures" 21:107 and "a most honorable Messenger" 81.19. yet what we saw of him is anything but.

Do you think that the example set by Muhammad as we saw in stories of Juwairiyah and Safiyah should be followed by the Muslims?

If you say yes then of course you are saying that Muslims should raid the houses of the non-Muslims, kill them and rape their wives. If you say no and that what Muhammad did 1400 years ago should not be applied in the 21st century context, then

all those above verses that tell the Muslims to follow the examples of the prophet become meaningless.

The problem is that Muslims are not consistent. Do we have to follow the examples of the prophet or not? Did he set good examples for humanity to follow or not?

Obviously you do not think that those examples are good for today. That is why you are excusing for him and saying that we should not judge him by our modern day standards and that what he did was not considered bad in his own time. So you do not think he is a good example for us. In that case he should not be emulated anymore. If that is your conclusion then doesn't this make Muhammad irrelevant?

Muhammad was not just a historic figure. Washington might have slept with his maid slaves. In those days perhaps it was okay and we should not judge him harshly. But no one says that he is an example for all mankind to follow. The question here is not whether what Muhammad did was right or wrong according to the standard of the people of his time but whether he set a good example for mankind to follow. Obviously the answer is no and therefore even if Muhammad is not guilty, those verses of the Quran that eulogize him and tell us we should emulate him are wrong. You can't believe in those verses and at the same time say that today we should not follow the example of Muhammad anymore because times are changed. Does the Quran say that the Muslims should stop following him at anytime in future?

So far we established that Muhammad is not a good example for all mankind and for all times. We also established that all those Quranic verses that say he was a good example to follow are lies. As the result we can determine that not everything in the Quran is true and hence not all of it is the word of God.

These are two important discoveries. First of all that Muhammad is not a good example, at least for today, and

secondly those verse that say so are lies. If he lied once could he have lied more? Is it possible that the Quran is mistaken not just in this case but in other cases as well?

You state that no Muslim in this day and age follows the example of the prophet and hence the question whether his example is good or bad is irrelevant.

Why most Muslims do not follow the examples of the messenger anymore? Doesn't this mean that the Muslims in general have a superior moral standard than that of their prophet? Why follow a man whose standard of morality was not as high as ours? Shouldn't we follow someone better than ourselves?

The next question is WHY Muslims do not follow the examples set by their prophet despite the fact that he told them to do so? Muslims today do not do what their prophet did because they follow their conscience and they see what he did was immoral and unethical. In other words Muslims do not follow Muhammad but their own conscience. If that is the case why hold unto him at all?

If we have to use our own logic to determine whether it is right to follow what he did or not doesn't this mean that we value our own logic more than we value him?

Thanks heaven, most of the Muslims do not follow Muhammad, his words or his examples. But what would happen if they did? There are some Muslims who do. They do not use their conscience to decide whether what he did was right or not. They follow him in everything because they trust him more than they trust the human intelligence and human conscience. Osama bin Laden is one such Muslim. Imagine what would have happened if all the Muslims were like him? Imagine what would happen if all the Muslims followed Muhammad's examples to the letter.

Did Muhammad come to set a good example or did he follow the example of the people he called "ignorant" Jaheliya?

If he followed the example of the ignorant people of his time, by following him aren't we following those ignorant people by proxy? By telling people to follow me because I have "sublime morals", a "good example to follow" and "a most honorable Messenger" didn't he mislead people when in reality he was not setting a good example but following the bad example of the ignorant people of his time?

What is the conclusion then? The conclusion is that the moderate and good people who think they are Muslims are those who are less Muslims. Those who are real Muslims are really dangerous and evil people. Doesn't this prove that Islam is evil? I leave that to the Jury to decide. The more a person is Islamic, the more seriously he takes the Quran, the more dangerous he becomes. Why is that so? Doesn't this prove that the Quran misleads people?

If a book of guidance tells me to wage war against my neighbor, kill him and enslave and rape his wife, beat my wives if they are obedient, marry four but have sex with any number of women I can capture in war but I have to use my own intelligence and not do all these things, then what is the use of that book of guidance? Isn't it ironic to bring a book of guidance that misguides people and then tell them to use your own intelligence and do what is right? Is God playing joke on us? What kind of pathetic God would do such thing?

Now I recapitulate:

Please leave every other argument aside for now and concentrate on the charge. Based on the evidence provided above and the confession made in the books of hadith and other history books, Muhammad raped his prisoners of war. I invite you to defend Muhammad of this charge.

By definition, any nonconsensual sexual activity constitutes rape. Can you tell me how a slave girl whose freedom has been taken away can consent to sex?

The prosecution rests

Ali Sina

Part IV

Rape 2

Nov 20, 2003

Rebuttal to Part 3 and Motion to Dismiss the Case

Dear Jury and Humanity at large, and Mr. Sina,

The defense at the conclusion of this Part 3 moves to demand a motion to dismiss the case based on the prosecutor's very self incriminating and damaging statements. The motion also demands complete explanation from the prosecutor about the real motive behind the propaganda campaign as has now been derived from the prosecutor's own statements.

The Motion is summarized based on the following two statements made by the prosecutor (a record of which has been made and recorded/backed up through current day technology means):

In the response to Part 3, at one point the prosecutor states: *"Bukhari, the **great biographer** of Muhammad, narrates the attack on Bani al-Mustaliq in the following story (Hadith)"*

This statement by the defense can be taken to mean that the prosecutor admires the biographer greatly and hence the prosecutor's ENTIRE case is dependent upon the narrations of

this biographer, one additional narrator named Bukhari, and derived works from the two biographers.

The prosecutor, then in attempt to present the case of Juwairiyah, claims the following:

*"The rest of the story of Juwairiyah is mixed with **half-truths and exaggerations**, in the manner that have **tainted most of the Hadiths**."*

The two statements taken together throws the prosecutor's case into total disarray, for the prosecutor has himself now impugned the same evidence that he has used throughout the case to actually build the case in the first place. The prosecutor, by having admitted that the evidence is "half-truths, exaggerations, and tainted hadiths" has himself rendered his own case null and void. The defense then has reason that prosecutor also does not view derivative works spawned from the "tainted" hadiths as also reliable. The defense has no reason to now believe anything that the prosecutor will use as evidence, because it goes against any logic in any setting of any debate or legal discourse that the prosecutor is allowed to use the very same evidence he claims as "tainted" and then proceeds to use it to accuse the defendant. This is tantamount to "bad faith" in current day legal procedures, and displays a strong personal bias by the prosecutor, and a predisposition towards the guilt of the defendant, and actually bordering on hostility rooted in personal disagreement with an entire ideology. The disagreement with ideology is not the reason for this motion to dismiss the case, but solely because the prosecutor has exposed his own desire to render his own evidence as tainted. Such evidence, without regard to how the defense would have liked to use it or accepts it, cannot be used by the prosecutor anymore to further this case. Henceforth, any evidence produced by prosecutor which is dated after the hadiths will not be acceptable.

The defense is now at a severe disadvantage because the prosecutor has left the door WIDE OPEN for any interpretation of the evidence which has been impugned here. Further, defense also finds it disingenuous that the stories presented of marriages are first stated as a matter of fact according to prosecution, and then the prosecutor turns around and calls the events of the case himself as "half truths and exaggerations". It is now unclear whether prosecutor is exaggerating the accounts of marriages, is maligning the narrators Bukhari and Muslim, the derivative works afterwards, or attempting to rewrite history himself.

In absence of any clarity is prosecutor's objectivity as it relates to the evidence being used by prosecutor, all the stories are now open to interpretation. And therefore, defense may now wish to submit the more accurate version of the stories, since prosecutor has invoked "half truths and exaggerations". A **paraphrased** version of one of the marriages (to demonstrate) is used here since readers can themselves read the full hadiths themselves, which prosecution submits as "tainted".

Volume 3, Book 46, Number 717 (Bukhari) **and** *Book 019, Number 4292: (Muslim)*

During the wars of 1400 years ago, in one of the battles, some of the opposition men were killed, and their dependents taken as prisoners. One of them was a future wife of the defendant.

Based on the "half true and exaggerated" story that prosecutor presented, Juwairiya's dowry was paid and she was taken into matrimony.

The defense does not want to address all the derivations that the prosecutor has made, since all the subjective opinions are of the prosecutor himself, without any real evidence presented which also submits the same conclusions. Obviously, if the story is "half true and exaggerated", it can mean any number of things.

Furthermore, prosecution yielded a few answers, in light of which the stories of multiple marriages once again are irrelevant.

Mr Sina submitted: *"I agree that the moral fortitude of a person should be judged with the morality of his contemporaries and his people" and "Finally I do agree that sleeping with a slave girl 1400 years ago in Arabia was not considered immoral. And yes in "most" Islamic nation today such think is not practiced."*

Defendant lived 1400 years ago amongst and Arab culture where multiple marriages and slave keeping were normal, and defendant married a slave, and prosecutor admits that in most Islamic nations the practice of slavery is gone. So once again, the stories of multiple marriages are by the prosecutor as irrelevant to the ideology, and prosecutor recognizes that certain norms that the prophet subscribed to, do not exist in current Islamic societies (multi-marrying or keeping slaves). The prosecution then once again says that the prophet was a "prophet of God for all times and for all the Humanity" but then concedes that one of the practices attributable to him is given up by the same people who actually are being blamed for accepting a fallacy according to the prosecution. The defense, including the entire jury, is now confused as to which direction the prosecutor's whims are going. On one hand the objection is that Muhammad had no business being a model for all times, and then on the other, complains why he is not, since most Islamic nations have stopped emulating one of the norms of ancient Arabic societies. Prosecutor is asking, *"Muhammad should not be emulated because he was not fit for current times, but why are you not emulating him and keeping slaves and marrying them?"* (Side note: This is called a classic Catch 22)

Defense hereby demands a clarification on the position of prosecution as it relates to **"half-truths and exaggerations,** in

the manner that have **tainted most of the Hadiths''**, and failure to yield a satisfactory answer by prosecution about the evidence, throws the case into nothing more than a hodgepodge of subjective rulings made by prosecution by reading more into the evidence that prosecution himself concedes as tainted.

So either is evidence is good, or it is not. Prosecution cannot have it both ways.

The defense actually wishes to rest the entire case at this point, pending a further response to this rebuttal.

Thank you.

R Shahzad

From **Ali Sina** to **Rahee Shahzad**

The defense council is presenting a motion to dismiss the case of rape against the defendant. He is contending that since the prosecutor himself doubts that the evidence presented is entirely true and it contains half truths and exaggerations the entire case against the defendant should be thrown out of the court and the defendant be found innocent.

Had these evidences been produced by the enemies of the defendant, the defense council would be right. One must not give too much credence to the evidence presented by the enemies of an accused especially if those testimonies are shown to be half-truth and exaggerations. Had this been the case, i.e. if the prosecution had relied entirely on some half-truth evidence concocted by the biased enemies of the defendant then the motion presented by the defense council could be taken seriously.

Nevertheless this is not the case; the evidence presented here by the prosecution is entirely taken from the **confessions** of the

followers of the defendant. There is no reason to believe that they lied to accuse their beloved prophet of crimes such a rape, genocide, torture, child molestation, lewdness or assassination if these thing never happened. However it is in the nature of the followers of any religion or cult to exaggerate the virtues of the man they believe to be a superior being such as a messenger of God or a prophet especially if he has let them to believe that he is endowed with “sublime morals” and a “Mercy of God for all the Creation”.

Hence the prosecutor has the right to focus on those parts of the confessions of the believers that incriminate the defendant and dismiss as half-truth and exaggeration the parts that extol the defendant's virtues or border fantasy and hocus pocus such as miracles performed by the defendant. This however does not invalidate the entire testimony.

The prosecutor calls Bukhari “great” because this is how he is perceived by the great majority of the Muslims. The books of Bukhari are the repository of the Sunnah and constitute the backbone of the Sharia. They are also invaluable sources of historic facts about Muhammad. Those books were read and followed by 90% of the Muslims for the last 1200 years and without them the practice of the Sharia and even the correct comprehension of the Quran would become impossible. The rituals of prayers, fast and hajj that are the pillars of Islam are only described in these books. Without the hadith, the practice of Islam would be impossible. As a matter of fact, without them, the very historic existence of Muhammad could be cast into doubt.

The books of Bukhari and Muslim contain many inaccuracies, exaggerations and half-truths. Those inaccuracies, exaggerations and half-truths can be attributed to the intense love of the believers and also to sycophantism that is part of human nature especially in oppressive cultures and backward milieus such as

Islam where the personality cult is practice. Muhammad presented himself as the center of the universe, the only intermediary between man and God for the rest of the existence of mankind in this planet and, according to an Iranian hadith, he is reported to have said that God would not have created the universe if it were not for him. (quoting from memory. not to be taken as evidence. However similar concepts of Muhammad being special abound in the Quran and hadith such as when he says that "The Prophet is closer to the Believers than their own selves and his wives are their mothers" 33:6)

It is natural and expected that the followers of any cult lie to extol their leader and fabricate tales about his virtues. However it is not expected that they invent stories that would incriminate their beloved prophet. If those incriminatory stories about Muhammad exist and especially they are in such an abundance, we have no reason to cast doubt to their authenticity. Even though the details in these stories vary; the very fact that different people narrated the same story is proof that the story must be true.

The defense failed to rebut the charge. He instead dismissed all the evidence and the confessions of the followers of the defendant on the bases that the prosecution does not buy into some of the exaggerations made in those confessions. I doubt any jury in his right mind would agree with the defense.

When an accused and/or his followers are cross-examined, it is expected of them to concoct stories that would make the accused look innocent. The prosecutor and the jury do not have to agree with those statements where the defendant and his devotees extol him. The prosecution doubts the honesty of the defendant and his followers in telling the truth about his virtues. However this does not invalidate their entire testimony. When his followers say that Muhammad produced water from between

his fingers, the prosecution wants proof. However when they say that he massacred an entire population, took their women and children as slaves and then kept the prettiest woman for himself, the prosecution accepts that, as fact especially when it is repeated in so many documents. It is up to the defense to refute these confessions of the believers. Can the defense council give us his reasons why he thinks those testimonies that incriminate Muhammad are to be dismissed? If they were not true why for 1200 years no one disputed them? Why they are classified as Sahih (authentic)? How is it that the same stories are repeated in several other sources? And how he can explain off the details in those stories? These hadiths contain names of so many people and they are so detailed that no reasonable person can dismiss them as false. And finally WHY? Why would the believers fabricate such stories to incriminate the man whom they loved so much?

We have enough evidence from the Quran, the hadith and the early books of history to indict the defendant and find him guilty of all the charges including rape that is being brought against him in this part of the trial.

The defense council also seems to be confused about the questions raised by the prosecutor. The questions raised however are very clear. The prosecution asked.

a- Muhammad claimed to have sublime morals and a good example to follow.

b- Muhammad followed the example of the people of his time whom he called ignorant. Therefore instead of setting a good example he gave in to the vices of the people whom he came to guide.

c- As the result his followers are confused and believing in his words in (a) they follow his example in (b). Consequently the vices of an "ignorant" and primitive society of 1400 years ago is

now being practiced by a billion plus of his followers who are duped into believing his claim of being a good example to follow. Muhammad was not a trendsetter and a good example but a follower and a practitioner of a barbarian culture. By following him the societies that have succumbed to his lies have become stagnant and they are unable to liberate themselves of the morality of those primitive people whom Muhammad called ignorant. Honor killing in Islamic countries is just one symptom of this stagnation.

Based on the arguments presented the defendant must be found guilty of lying, misrepresentation and misleading his followers. The fact that he was a man of his time is no excuse. He was a man of his time with the same vices of other “ignorant” men of his time, yet he claimed to have superior morals and an example to follow for all times. He misled his followers and he lied.

This is of course another charge, distinct from the charge of rape that is presented in this case and was not disputed by the defense except for the fact that he tried in vain to disallow the evidence and the confessions of the defendant’s followers.

The prosecution rests and calls upon the jury to find the defendant guilty for the charges of rape and misrepresentation.

If the defense agrees, we can close this case and move on to other topics.

Part V

Rape 3

Nov 26, 2003

This response is needed because the defense had in good faith anticipated that the prosecution will find a certain way of still examining the same evidence to further the case. Hence, the

defense did not in good faith anticipate that prosecution will actually agree to the Motion, but the motion to dismiss had to be brought as a matter of discourse because prosecutor himself came across as somewhat dazed and confused, and then proceeded to add charges of rape and misrepresentation to the case. The defense finds it amusing that prosecution is upping the ante on the charges as we are proceeding, without making a full case. Now rape has been accused, without even the current day standards kept in mind. Even in a court of law in USA, it takes months for certain rape trials to conclude, and prosecutor actually now accuses the defendant, posthumously, of rape, which even in today's society has certain elements to be presented before an accused is found guilty. If rape was such an open and shut case, all you would need is a woman or man who comes forward and says "I was raped". In fact, the first requirement is that the person come forward and claim that rape occurred. The merits of the claim then make up the case against any accused person, and the accused has the right to present evidence to counter the claim. In fact, the Muslim holy scriptures require four witnesses of rape (but the scripture is not being used here as defense, only to state what the standards are.)

If prosecutor accepts that Bukhari and Muslim are two great biographers, then either he accepts their impartiality, or he does not. There's no logical sense made by using the two individuals to present a case, and then at other times to turn around and suspect the motives of the same two people. Either Bukhari and Muslim were good objective people or they were not. Defense demands that prosecution make this ABSOLUTELY clear, in no uncertain terms. If prosecution wishes to pursue this case objectively, then defense demands a declaration of statement from prosecution:

"I, Ali Sina, hereby declare that Bukhari and Muslim, the two most revered hadith writers whose works are cited as the basis

for a lot of current day Islamic jurisprudence, or the so called "way of life till eternity", were two individuals of sound morals and aptitude, and their work has then been used by other historians as analysis of many ideas and events. These two individual's accounts and narrations are accurate and not filled with any sort of personal bias on their part. Hence, if the narrations do not have any irrefutable factual basis for any crime committed and explicitly stated, then defense is allowed to seek relief from the same source as a matter of reasonable inference that no crime occurred."

If Ali Sina makes the declaration, then defense moves once again that there are no accusations of rape in Bukhari and Muslim, and hence the defense cannot defend what does not exist in the same evidence being used. If Ali Sina wishes to not make the above declaration, then their use of the evidence presented by Bukhari and Muslim is not allowed.

Otherwise the case is once again being fought on the personal opinions of the prosecution, without any documented proof of rape or misrepresentation. If rape is being accused, then first the woman has to come forward and claim it. Otherwise this amounts to prosecution bringing out a claim to which there really is no grieving party. If Juwairiya was in any way "raped", then defense demands as to what historical account of this claim exists. If Bukhari and Muslim are mentioning this, defense needs to see it. If other independent sources of 1400-1200 years ago are saying this, defense needs to see these too.

If prosecution fails to produce a single source where the word "rape" is used, or any author of a thousand years ago is alleging or inferring "rape" in different verbiage, or a source exists of Juwairiya's own claim that rape occurred, then defense is prepared to defend it. Otherwise, this tantamount in today's society as bringing a charge that cannot be established in any

way possible. If prosecutor just wants to continue pursuing the "rape" charge without providing a single source of 1200 year ago literature that claims that such was the case, then prosecution is accusing with prejudice and bad faith, knowing full well that there is no evidence to state clearly or inferring from any authority, Islamic or otherwise.

Hence defense cannot defend "rape" charges unless prosecution presents solid proof that any source of 1400-1200 years ago mentions this in any way, shape or form, except what can be inferred from "privacy in the tent".

Defense finds prosecution being severely prejudiced not only against the defendant, but also to the sources being used as evidence, including all the derivative works. Prosecution cannot build a case by mocking the same sources being used to bring the case.

However, if Ali Sina is allowed to make inferences by reading the historical account through Bukhari and Muslim's works and derivatives, then defense is now also allowed to make inferences, and the jury, which includes the "entire" humanity, except those who have a predisposed bias towards the defendant and the ideology of Islam or other religions based on some spiritual existence of a perfect God, now has to conclude as to whose inference is more apt in a situation where matters of divine intervention are involved. Defense hereby, as a matter of inference and objective application of the same logic used by prosecution, hereby submits that the Juwairiya case, as cited in Bukhari and Muslim, did not involve sex in "privacy in the tent".

Just as prosecutor is allowed to make judgement calls on what really happened by picking a few choice words, defense then presents the following as a more plausible account:

There is not a single mention of the word "sex", or "intercourse", or "fondling", or "advances", or "noises" in the

entire historical account of Bukhari or Muslim. The only thing mentioned is that the defendant wanted some privacy, and Juwairiya had been a captive of war, and defendant paid ransom for her to the father. The “captive” at this point was a free woman, given away by her dad in lieu of the ransom received, and herself then asked to move forward to a safer place where the defendant could have “privacy” with her. (Now the defense inference is invoked) The defendant did this because it is documented that Juwairiya was quite good looking, and the defendant was afraid that she may be abused if left unguarded in time of hostilities. The defendant then at a later point in the travel, went into the tent and consoled her about the events that had taken place, and explained to her that her protection was necessary on account of her above average beauty. She was then given a thorough explanation of the entire ideology and told that divine intervention is at play here. After a few hours, the defendant and the newly freed “captive” slept peacefully without getting involved in any physical acts. In the morning, when the defendant went outside the tent, he saw a sentry guarding the place and asked why it was so. The sentry explained that in this time of hostilities, personal safety of the defendant and that of his new wife were of paramount importance. The defendant then thanked the sentry, and the entourage later moved to a safer place. The next day a “walima” was given and many people attended. The new wife was given a place to live, and the other wives became somewhat jealous. Through the course of the balance of his lifetime, the defendant always remained compassionate about the ex-jew, and asked her to tell the other jealous wives that Juwairiya is of a respectable lineage, even though she had been a jew. Juwairiya did not produce a child 9 months later, which is another fact inferring that sex never took place in the tent earlier. When the times became peaceful, and Juwairiya was viewed respectably by the community as a

dignified wife of the defendant, she may have had a normal wife relationship with the defendant. Her own accounts of the story never revealed that she was “raped” at any point, and all scholars and biographers have no reason to suspect as such. No Islamic, Jewish or Christian source exists that may have heard Juwairiya claiming that such was the case. The defendant kept her as a wife till his death, and Juwairiya even at an old age never said that she was ever humiliated sexually or deprived of dignity as a wife. She died a peaceful death, and today remains as an accepted companion of the defendant, with all the dignity that she deserved back then and today. She bore the defendant no children at all. Her soul rests in peace today, even though during one point of her lifetime, she did have to face a terrible tragedy of having lost her kin in war. However, even with today’s standards, people of all religions and races, do in fact face tragedies of greater magnitude, but the world is a complex set of conflicting forces, and there’s no reason to believe that the society of 1400 years ago had complete harmony, and was utterly homogenous. Just as today, then also was the world subject to human differences of opinion on a lot of issues, and also of difference in religious ideologies. May Juwairiya find eternal peace. Amen.

The defense hereby once again invokes that if prosecutor is allowed to make all kinds of inferences from the sources used, the defense has taken the exact same liberty. If the defense position is not going to be accepted as a possible inference from the evidence submitted, the prosecutor’s inference also then is ridden with the same problem. If the “privacy in the tent” is going to be used to infer that sex did in fact take place, the defense wants absolute, irrefutable evidence that such was the case. If prosecution cannot prove beyond doubt that sex, forced or otherwise, took place in the tent, then there’s no objective reason to believe it did. At this point, the prosecution’s position

is mere conjecture and opinionated, and the words “lust” and “slaves” are nothing more than tools of propaganda against the defendant. Prosecution is possibly employing his own view of the sexual world today, and may possibly even suffer from a certain psychological deficiency in matters of sex. Defense also then would state that Ali Sina’s position on homosexuality, teen pregnancy, sex outside of marriage, pornography, sex at advanced age, minimum age requirements for sex, abortion, same sex marriages, sex paraphernalia, and other sexual topics, has not been stated anywhere in the case or this site. There is not a single article on this entire website that somehow states the prosecution’s position on sexuality in current societies. The jury and defense is at an extreme disadvantage because prosecutor has not stated anything about his own views on sexual matters. It can be assumed reasonably that prosecutor may see a 50 year-old-person and a sobbing younger lady walk into a hotel room, “the tent”, and immediately conclude that rape is about take place behind closed doors. Such psychological state of mind needs to be examined by the jury and defense.

The defense emphatically demands that a position be stated on this site about all sexual matters as listed above, without which, the jury and defense is left with nothing but to guess only about the moral aptitude of the prosecutor, since it is he and sympathetic to his cause who are bringing the charges of “rape” in the first place by citing the “privacy in the tent” accounts of Bukhari and Muslim. Mere conjecture is not sufficient for jury to take prosecutor’s words as a matter of fact. Hence, defense, in absence of any document claiming to the contrary, and also at the disadvantage of knowing the prosecutor and FFI’s stated position on matters of sex, hereby rejects all accusations of “rape” of Juwairiya. Even by current legal standards, mere accusations or charges brought by a private entity or governments are not automatic finding of guilt of the defendant. Since prosecutor

lives in a western environment himself, he is fully aware that accusations need to be supported by preponderance of the evidence, and in cases of rape, by a unanimous finding of guilt based on evidence supporting the claim beyond all reasonable doubt (The Kobe Bryant case for example). If hearsay, conjecture, assumptions, and inferences were allowed, then any woman or man today can claim that they were raped and the accused be found guilty. If current standards do not allow this, why should it be allowed for a defendant 1400 years later? It seems hypocritical and not based on any objectivity.

Also as a matter of assumption, if the prosecutor was to find homosexuality immoral, then it stands to reason that the entire Christian church system may be ridiculed by him for having allowed a gay priest to be part of the clergy and hence being immoral. On this site, there's no opinion stated on this matter too.

The defense now in summary rejects the entire premise of "rape", which is solely based on the prosecution's inference that sex was involved in the "privacy in the tent". The defense has presented a counter inference also, and now it is up to prosecution to prove that the defense inference is flawed. If defense inference is flawed and rejected, the prosecutor automatically negates his own inference too, and then the "jury of humanity" can pick and choose. Defense emphatically states that those of the organized religion section of humanity will want to see the "good" in matters of divinity (regardless of positions on other matters of complexity), and those already opposed to the entire idea of divinity will find the "lust" aspect as true. In final analysis on the multiple marriage issue and charges of "rape" and slaves, there is no decision to be made, because the jury has already made up their mind, hence there's nothing to adjudicate. If defense was to really push the issue, the Virgin Mary can be accused of also not being a virgin at all. But defense does not

wish to go against the sensibilities of the largest organized religion of humanity (maybe at a later point in the case, the prosecutor will have to address the issue of “virgin” mother and his belief about that too)

Defense summarily rejects all charges of “rape”, immorality of multiple marriages and slave keeping, and will not address this issue again unless prosecutor brings some groundbreaking new source to light. Else, defense respectfully agrees to disagree and rests, regardless of any further discussion on these charges by prosecution, and not withstanding all the articles posted on this site.

As a matter of record of the defense position on ALL articles on this site about marriages, slaves, and defendant’s wives, the motivation by the defendant was one of “compassionate protection of women” in times of hostilities. The prosecutor’s position is one of “lust”, based on inferences. Where prosecution infers that sex was involved in all cases, defense states that sex was not necessarily involved in all cases, unless proven absolutely wrong by some new evidence of graphical nature (which the defense knows in advance does not exist). It can be argued that the prosecutor is exhibiting the same “extremism” that he ostensibly hates in the organized religion of Islam. And defense finds no benefit for the jury to side with the prosecutor, subscribing to one extreme element over another perceived extreme element.

Thank you.

R Shahzad

Mr. Shahzad, after realizing that dismissing the charge of rape against his client is not a reasonable defense, has now moved to disprove it.

The defense claims that since there are no victims of rape coming forward to accuse the defendant and since there were no witnesses to the rape then we should not find the defendant guilty posthumously.

The purpose of this trial is not to find the defendant guilty in order to sentence him. Obviously the defendant is dead and that would not be possible. The objective is however academic and we want to present the evidence that is available to us to prove that the defendant was not as holy as he claimed to be and hence unworthy of the station that he attributed to himself.

Finding the defendant guilty of rape and other charges is not only of historic value, it also has tremendous implication on how a billion of people think and behave today. This is of utmost importance since in the opinion of the prosecutor the belief in the defendant is the cause of much bloodshed, poverty and turmoil. Once the truth about the defendant surface, the belief in him and his violent teachings will diminish and the world will become a more peaceful place to live for all mankind. The defendant has claimed to be a messenger of God, of sublime morals and an example to follow. Since in the views of the prosecutor those are bogus claims, and in fact misleading, the followers of the defendant engage in the most despicable acts of violence while honestly they believe that such acts are divinely ordained and will attract the pleasure of the almighty God. The prosecution hopes to raise reasonable doubt about the defendant and prove that he was not a noble man but a vile criminal and hence open the eyes of his benighted followers, lead them out of fundamentalism and into the fold of humanity.

The purpose of this trial is not to just convict Muhammad but to shed light into his life and conduct, liberate his followers, foster unity of mankind by eliminating the most potent doctrine of hate and wage peace.

The defense attorney contends: *“If rape was such an open and shut case, all you would need is a woman or man who comes forward and says “I was raped”. In fact the first requirement is that the person come forward and claim that rape occurred”*.

This is an unacceptable excuse. We do not need the testimony of the victim to establish a crime. In many cases the victims are not alive to witness against their victimizers. It is up to the prosecutors to find reasonable evidence of the crime. The evidence of crime is often found from the testimony of the accused. The prosecution is aware that much of that testimony is false. His task is to find the needle of the truth in the haystack of lies. It is through the contradictions in the declarations of the defendant that the truth will eventually be extracted. In the case of Humanity vs. Muhammad, the prosecution has ample evidence and enough confessions taken from the contradictory statements of the accused and his followers to incriminate him without any shadow of doubt. The prosecution urges the Jury to dismiss all the claims of the defendant and his followers to his innocence but solely take into consideration the evidence that incriminate him. It is of course to be expected that the accused plead innocence and his fans praise his perceived virtues. What matters to this court are the statements taken from the defendant and his followers that prove the defendant guilty of the crimes as charged.

The defense attorney objects: *“If prosecutor accepts that Bukhari and Muslim are two great biographers, then either he accepts their impartiality, or he does not. There's no logical sense made by using the two individuals to present a case, and then at other times to turn around and suspect the motives of the same two people”*.

The prosecutor has already dismissed this objection. The prosecutor acknowledges Bukhari and Muslim as two devout

followers of Muhammad and therefore biased towards him. These historians collected the stories narrated by other believers. Verified the trustworthiness of the narrators to the best of their ability and using their own human judgment chose some as 1) Sahih (authentic), 2) Hasan (sound), 3) Dha'eef (weak), 4) Dha'eef Jiddan (very weak), and 5) Mawdhoo (fabricated). They chose only the Sahih (authentic) hadith and dismissed the rest. These men dedicated their entire life to those collections. We have no reason to doubt their devotion to the man they believed to be a prophet. They may have genuinely believed in the fabricated stories of the miracles attributed to their beloved prophet and exaggerated his virtues. This is understandable. Those stories must be read with a pinch of salt and pepper. However when they tell stories about his crimes with such details we have no reason to dismiss them. If there were not enough evidence for those crimes ever happening, these devout believers would not have reported them and surely someone would have objected. Therefore it is reasonable to believe that the stories of the crimes perpetrated by Muhammad are true while those attributing extraordinary powers to him are not.

In fact, such miracles attributed to Muhammad go against the Quran. According to the Quran when the disbelievers asked Muhammad to perform miracles:

Q. 17: 90 *They say: "We shall not believe in thee, until thou cause a spring to gush forth for us from the earth,*

he would reply:

Q. 17: 93 *Say: "Glory to my Lord! Am I aught but a man - a messenger?"*

Therefore just as the followers would willingly fabricate miracles attributing them to their beloved prophet, they would fabricate hadiths extolling his alleged virtues. But it is not reasonable to assume that the followers fabricate false stories

that would incriminate the one whom they love and literally worship.

Mr. Shahzad narrates the story of Safiyah (By mistake he calls her Juwairiyah. This is a minor error and not consequential) He claims that after massacring the relatives and the loved ones of Safiyah, the prophet saw how beautiful she was and hence decided to protect her from being abused. He sought privacy in the tent with her to “console” her and tell her that there is “divine intervention is at play here”.

He states that they slept together peacefully and nothing happened. But he does not explain why a man who claimed to be a messenger of God with sublime morals should sleep in the same tent with a beautiful woman.

Yes indeed on the first night nothing happened. But that does not mean that Muhammad did not make advances towards this grieving woman. The following passage in the story of Safiyah shows that the defendant did try to force himself on her but was rejected.

“The Prophet had a slight grievance against her for she had refused when the Prophet wanted to have privacy with her at the previous stage (of the journey)”.

The defense claims that the proof no sex was involved is that Safiyah never bore a child to Muhammad. Apart from the fact that this is absurd since not all intercourses end up in pregnancy, the answer is that Muhammad being an old man was most likely impotent. He was very much enslaved to sex and loved to fondle beautiful young women. But none of his numerous young women (with exception of Mariah, who was the maid of Hafsa one of his wives) bore him any child. (It is also debatable whether the slave girl Mariyah's child who died as infant really belonged to Muhammad.)

The following hadith shows that the defendant loved sex:

Bukhari Vol.7 Book.62 Number.6 Narrated Anas: The Prophet used to go round (have sexual relations with) all his wives in one night, and he had nine wives.

However this does not mean that he actually could keep up to those young women. He simply contents himself to undress them and fondle them.

Bukhari Vol.1 Book.6, Number.299 'Aisha said: "Whenever Allah's Apostle wanted to fondle anyone of us during her periods (menses), he used to order her to put on an Izar (dress worn below the waist) and start fondling her." 'Aisha added, "None of you could control his sexual desires as the Prophet could."

A man who wants to be in control does not go round fondling naked women. Although this must be what he told his young wives to save face, the truth is that most likely he simply could not do it. He found pleaser touching and fondling his naked women and hallucinating about having sex with them.

Volume 7, Book 71, Number 660 Narrated Aisha: Magic was worked on Allah's Apostle so that he used to think that he had sexual relations with his wives while he actually had not (Sufyan said: That is the hardest kind of magic as it has such an effect).

Could it be that the prophet's visions of Gabriel were also hallucinations? There is enough evidence to cast doubt on the sanity of Muhammad. However that is another charge and we shall discuss it in another occasion.

As the verses 4:24 and 23:1-7 of the defendants own book reveal, he did encourage his followers to rape the women captured in war. No reasonable person would accept that having sex with women captured as booty is consensual sex. What kind of woman would want to have sex with the murderers of her husband, father, brothers and other loved ones?

The fact that Muhammad committed rape is evident from the stories of Rayhanah, Safiyah and Juwairiyah and the fact that he sanctioned rape of the women captured in war is clear from the above Quranic verses.

The verse states: 4:24

Also (prohibited are) women already married, except those whom your right hands possess:

Right hand possessions are women captured in war.

The verses 23:1-7 describe the virtues of a believer that include abstaining from sex

Except with those joined to them in the marriage bond, or (the captives) whom their right hands possess, - for (in their case) they are free from blame.

The *right hand possessions* are women captured in war. The above verses are irrefutable proof that Muhammad sanctioned rape of the prisoners of war.

The defense claims to be in disadvantage for not knowing the position of the prosecutor on “homosexuality, teen pregnancy, sex outside of marriage, pornography, sex at advanced age, minimum age requirements for sex, abortion, same sex marriages, sex paraphernalia, and other sexual topics”.

Such an excuse is ludicrous. Why the position of the prosecutor on any of these issues should have any relevance to this case? We are putting on trial Muhammad for rape and other charges. Why should it matter to the defense or the jury what Ali Sina thinks about the above issues? If the defense wants to know what constitutes rape, the prosecutor will state that rape is any unconsensual sexual advance. And since the consensus of a captive woman cannot be recognized as freely obtained, sex with such woman constitutes rape. It is unreasonable to assume that a woman who has just lost her husband, father and many of her

relatives would want to have sex with the murderer of her loved ones. The defense cannot present the defendant's impotence as the excuse that rape did not happen. By violating the privacy of these women, even if that means just fondling with their naked bodies Muhammad had committed rape against them. The fact that the defendant could not have erection and therefore he could not penetrate is no excuse. The intent was rape, even though he was stopped by his physical inability.

As for the guilt of Muhammad, the evidence is overwhelming. We have historic facts narrated by his trusted followers, which prove without any shadow of doubt that rape happened. The complaint of the victims is not needed. In this case the victims could not complain to anyone. All their relatives were killed and they were hostages among the enemy.

The defense claims that the defendant married Safiyah and other beautiful women whom he captured in war to protect them from being abused. Or as he puts it “*The motivation by the defendant was one of **compassionate protection of women** in times of hostilities.*”

This is a lame excuse and a slap at the fact of justice. Muhammad used to fondle these women and had hallucinations of having sex with them. He prohibited them to remarry after his death even though the majority of these women were very young in their early twenties. If the defendant really cared about these women, he would not murder their husbands in the first place. The hostilities were all instigated by him. He was the aggressor. He raided the civilians with no warning, wreaked havoc and took away their peace, freedom, belongings, wives and lives. If he was motivated by compassion towards women he would not massacre their husbands and loved ones, he would not enslave them, he would not distribute them among his men as booty, he would not sanction raping them, he would not choose the

prettiest ones for himself, he would not order them to take their cloths off so he could fondle them and he would not have sexual thoughts about them.

The prosecutor finds the choice of the word “compassion” attributed to this ruthless man revolting. The prosecutor has studied the entire life of the defendant and has found him to be a man bereft of human feelings, compassion and conscience.

The prosecutor agrees with the defense to close this case and move on to other charges.

Next, we shall discuss the charge of pedophilia. The defense has already submitted his rebuttal and the prosecutor will try to respond.

Part VI

Pedophilia

Nov 28, 2003

Pedophilia

This post is further to Part 3, in which I presented the case that the merits of multiple marriages is a nonissue really, because you have gathered a lot of evidence to support the defendant's multiple wives, and then invoked the morality and framework of today's societies (especially those of western hemisphere), and have found defendant guilty of polygamy in 2003. I hereby reject that entire claim on ground that this to me tantamounts bringing George Washington back today and lynching him for having kept some black slaves, and for that reason alone, his entire product (and of those who aided him), namely the United States of America, needs to be not recognized as legitimate. If you are prepared to lynch all the founding fathers and render the USA an a nonentity, I then will have to reconsider. However, if you

cannot make a logical case against the founding fathers of USA based on some current moral code and are not willing to denounce the USA, then I find the prosecutor's conclusions about the defendant totally biased and riddled with holes in logic. The jury then has to be instructed accordingly, that the defense rests on the case of multiple marriages, on account of the prosecutor exhibiting a bias and presenting a case which defies the logic of most intellectuals.

The defense hereby submits that the case of practicing polygamy 1400 years and it being judged on basis of current day norms is not made convincingly, and the defendant be found not guilty.

The next portion of this case then goes to the heart of one marriage that is the source of contention and basis for the accusation of pedophilia. To give the reader some background on this, the basis of the case is that one of the wives of the defendant was an allegedly immature child of 9 years, and that the defendant thereby marrying her, practiced pedophilia. The morality of a 53 year old man marrying a 9 year old has also been invoked.

The defense will present the context of this portion and then go into counter-questioning to ask the prosecutor to yield a declaration of principle, based on which the jury will have to decide this particular aspect.

On this site, one of the articles that is presented by the prosecutor throw the prosecutor's case into doubt itself, by the sources referenced there. On account of the discrepancy in the sources, the defense then is free to make objective disagreement, and since the sources themselves are not in harmony, then the issue of the exact age is not proven beyond all doubts by the prosecutor.

For that article, please read it ***here***:

Here's the problem with the collection of sources (which are not divine and not construed as such by muslims collectively, they are historical accounts meant for the guidance of people today, who also have the collective authority to conclude the relevance of certain portions in today's world, and if some society wishes to take a hardline attitude, in respect of that, then it also is a problem for the societies which accepted it in the first place).

[The sources quoted:

Volume 5, Book 58, Number 236: Narrated Hisham's father: Khadija died three years before the Prophet departed to Medina. He stayed there for **two years** or so and then he married 'Aisha when she was a girl of **six years of age**, and he consumed that marriage when she was **nine years old.**]

Two or so plus 6 = 9?

Rendered Inconclusive, hence the muslims can decipher that she was of a fairly young age

[Book 008, Number 3311: Aisha (Allah be pleased with her) reported that Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) married her when she was **seven years old**, and he was taken to his house as a bride when she was **nine**, and her dolls were with her; and when he (the Holy Prophet) died she was eighteen years old.]

Ayesha 9 at alleged consummation, defendant 53, defendant passed away at 63, and $9+10=19$, but source mentions 18. Inconclusive. Hence reasonableness by current society is invoked and the source is not denounced, but the hadees understood to mean that Ayesha was of a young age at marriage. Further, seven years old then contradicts the previous sahih hadith, thereby both sahih hadees contradicting each other, and the prosecutor on account of referencing both of them has brought the accuracy of age into question. To choose one over the other then is being forced onto the defense

[He married Aisha in Mecca when she was a child of **seven** lived with her in Medina when she was **nine or ten**. She was the **only virgin** that he married. Her father, Abu Bakr, married her to him and the apostle gave her four hundred dirhams.(Ref. 3, page 792)]

The defense has now even more reason to doubt the source as not being absolutely conclusive. Inconclusive and Incorrect are two different things. Hence defense does not deny the Hadees, but invokes that the verbage allows some room for reasonable inference. Hence, since the prosecutor has opened up the possibility of the exact age being inconsistently listed in the referenced sources, it can be then reasonably inferred that the exact age is arguable. The defense then has the liberty to claim that the age being discussed, if **ONLY** the above sources are read, falls within a range, and that range can then also have an additional year or two added. If 9 or 10 can be read, then 10 or 11 or 12 can be read without being logically completely out of the range being addressed and context. The defense will then state for the jury that Ayesha can be portrayed as a young girl, whose age can fall within a specific range. If the prosecutor has the liberty to choose the lower end, the defense then has the liberty to choose the upper reasonable range. By doing so, the defense will address Ayesha as being a “young girl” of age 12, which 12 also has been researched by many well intentioned independent scholars and the collective reasonable person standard is employed, without rejecting the Hadees in totality. (By some scholars, they come to even 14 also as the age, and the jury needs to know this aspect about the scholars disagreeing without denouncing Hadees)

If the prosecutor wishes to absolutely claim 9 calendar or lunar years, then the following will have to be provided in addition to the above sources:

1- The medical records and birth certificate from the hospital where she was born

2- Her marriage certificate with her date exactly stated

3- Her physical makeup as one of a girl not having reached puberty

4- A distinct source disclaiming that she had not experienced menses at time of the “consummation” of marriage

5- A historically irrevocable source attesting that she had no mental aptitude or capacity to object to sex, and in addition, had no ability to be a reasonable wife to any man of any age.

6- Undisputed sources that the girl’s father, mother, the society, both the opponents of the cause and the proponents alike, objected vehemently to the event as totally unacceptable

However, if the prosecutor cannot provide any or all of the above, then any text which tackles the issue of age 1000 or more years after the fact is hereby discarded by defense too. Charges brought today under a particular constitution and the defendant charged posthumously under a variant code 1400 years later is also then looked upon by defense with extreme skepticism. Unless all the sources combined decisively pin down the exact dates, the defense submits that the prosecutor is employing selective information to further his point of view, and is not making a case with clarity and unambiguity.

Furthermore, “consummation” as having meant sexual intercourse, here is being forced upon the jury also. The defense is not disputing that consummation cannot mean intercourse, but prosecutor has provided no evidence that consummation to a 12 year-old actually means intercourse. In fact, the prosecutor is contradictory in the inferences made on this site. On one hand the insistence by the prosecutor is that the young girl was immature and playing with dolls is somehow reflective of her

being a child mentally and physically. On the other hand, she is also being trusted to recall the meaning of “consummation”, no matter at what age the Hadees is attributable to her. Consummation means intercourse by a reasonable person standard, and the defense concedes this, but prosecutor has not provided any source that this intercourse is exactly what she is saying. As a married person myself, without going into details, and those in jury who are married, can use your imagination that “consummation” can mean a variety of things on that one night, which you can always think of as consummation, but the defense is not convinced that all married people actually do exactly the same things. This is not somehow a play on your reasonableness, but a statement of fact that the prosecutor cannot make a convincing case of immaturity and maturity at the same time.

Let’s now follow by accepting what consummation is reasonably supposed to mean, which means the act of performance between a husband and wife. Hence the prosecutor has invoked pedophilia.

The defense will now present aspects of pedophilia and make the case that it is being employed incorrectly and that the defendant did not practice it:

Pedophilia is a societal unacceptable practice of an individual who seeks illegitimate pleasure by having sex with “children”

This definition by itself then needs a few elements to exist, and the absence of those elements then will mean that the defendant cannot be charged or found guilty of them. If the prosecutor has some definition of his own, then it needs to be stated on the site in clarity for the defense to counter it within that context. Since the prosecutor has not really presented any definition of pedophilia from any historic source or perspective whatsoever, the use of the word “pedophile” is entirely based on personal ambiguous definitions, a predisposed bias against all

societies of past and present, without any clear indication given as to what exactly the “child” aspect meant 1400 years ago.

I will now explore the elements of pedophilia by invoking the definition myself, since prosecutor has not stated anywhere on site what he means by pedophilia.

The first aspect is one of social acceptability, and here social acceptability does not mean a universal one too. Just as diets and climates and other factors dictate people’s growth patterns to a certain degree, that society also then has the right and ability to decipher what remains within reason or surpasses it. Secondly, Acceptability of a practice universally is not the prerequisite for its legitimacy within a certain independent society. If women want to live naked in the Amazon jungle, it’s not illegitimate in the Amazon. A third element, not in isolation but in addition to first two, is that of the “nature” of illegitimacy or unethical. Hence that society in which a practice is considered ethical and legitimate and within the reasonable norm of that particular society, and not in absolute stark contrast with other societies of present past or future, then has to be taken into account. And the fourth element then needs to be of the interest of sexual pleasure, without any consideration of any other objective but to quench a bodily desire as being the only motive of the person actively involved in pedophilia or contemplating it. If all four of these elements are not applicable in combination, pedophilia by definition does not apply.

Universal Social Acceptability (1/2 above): Regardless of the prosecutor’s insistence that moral relativity is a useless philosophy, that does not automatically render it null and void. Hence if a society accepts certain acts to be within the realms of reasonableness, and devoid of any shock value or violating a basic human right to exist, then that society is free to allow the members practice it freely. This is the basic tenet even of USA

that grants many freedoms. Cannibalism hence will be stopped if found by other parallel societies as of the same time period based on the shock value it renders to parallel societies. Ethics also then are of that society alone. Since the prophet's marriage does not have any convincing source or criticism by the thinkers, writers or intellectuals of 1400 years ago, or even 1200 years ago, then it has to be accepted that marriage to young girls was an acceptable act and did not rupture the moral fabric of that time. Mr. Sina then will have to provide convincing, irrefutable evidence from any source of about a 1400 years ago to convince the defense that a shock value, displeasure, unacceptability, ridicule, and rejection was associated with the defendant's marriage to Ayesha. If the prosecutor wants to construct an imaginary society and then place the defendant in it and create imaginary shock value, then that is disingenuous. If the prosecutor is invoking pedophilia based on his perceived definition of some "universal" society, then the jury is being intentionally misguided.

Unethical or Illegitimate: The societal acceptable act of a marriage between a man and woman was achieved by the defendant, and is not disputed by the prosecutor. Sexual aspect is not part of this element. Hence if today a marriage anywhere is performed by a man to a girl of 3 years old (it IS done in some parts of India), but the sexual aspect is not realized by the partners until the girl is of an age where sex can reasonably be expected as a natural outcome of the bond, then that marriage at 3 years of age by itself is not unethical or illegitimate. If this does not appeal to someone's advanced sensibilities, it is not the problem of that society, but of that one person who is shocked at such alleged "perverseness", according to the one being shocked, and if the prosecutor's sensibilities are being challenged, and other's have got the perspective that the event deserves, then the prosecutor's shock value is largely a product of a certain brand

of indoctrination and a predisposed bias to a certain race, class, time in history, or an individual such as the defendant. To ask that society which was not shocked 1400 years ago, to today suddenly come back and display horror, or to ask a current society which has largely accepted the fact that times have changed and what was reasonable 1400 years ago has now found a shift in attitude, is asking almost for the impossible. Differences in ideology are all fine, but to ask people to take a certain portion of history and denounce the entire present day fabric, is quite a bit of stretch. Of course that does not mean that everyone is going to assess the event and take the wisdom from it, but to denounce an entire ideology by giving reference to a few events, is ambitious at best.

Sexual Pleasure: By itself, a man or woman deriving sexual pleasure has never been objectionable by any society. Amongst most societies, marriage is a legal permission for it, and some societies have adjusted to sex also capable of being acceptable even without a legal marriage contract. But pedophilia is then the unethical practice of it being sought from a “child”. But the view of “child” is also an important part of the mix. The “child”, hence is not a universal constant and has never been in any society. Of course, as I stated earlier, within reasonableness, parallel societies do conform to a range. A “child” in USA for example is up to the age of 18 years of age for most legal situations. This imposition of a hard number is done for many complicated legal considerations, but biologically this number 18 really has no compulsory basis whatsoever. It would be foolish to think that at 17 years 354 days a person is a child, and then the next day he is an adult biologically. If some biological proof exists that some visible or biological change takes place at the passage of that one day, then the defense needs to see it. But defense and prosecutor will have to then agree in absence of such source that 18 years of age as the distinction between “child” and

“adult” is because of the current day requirement of absolutes required in multiple situations. Driving license for example, can be given at a recognizable and provable point in a person’s life in USA and other countries. But even in USA, a different limitation exists for various situations involving age. The defense does not want to explore each and every one of them and leaves it to the jury to use their judgment. So, in establishment of someone as a child 1400 years ago, the use of current day 18 or 16 or even 14 year boundary does not have strong merit.

Hence, if a child has to be called a child, in absence of the current day availability of age records, then some advent of a biological nature has to be used to judge that society. For girls, this can be then the onset of the menses cycle, and for boys can be ability to reproduce, and for both groups can be the visibility of pubic hair. This is partly one reason in my opinion that holy scriptures and Hadees have quite a bit of reference to menses. The defense does not want to explore this graphically anymore to respect the sensibilities of the audience, but hopefully the gist of the point is understood. All girls can understand when they first experienced a biological event. This event (the womanhood cycle) is not the same across the globe even today. Diets and climates, and genetics make it variable for different parts of the world. Some girls can get the cycle as early as 8, and some may experience as late as 12. And then there are probably some exceptional cases too. The medical community can provide more of this information. The chest of girls also then not a constant given for each girl. There are enough girls at 8 who probably have more visible chest than some 16 year olds. Even in current day USA, you can find some 10 year-old-girls who have all the characteristics of a well-endowed woman. So instead of exploring this medical aspect, the defense then leaves it up the imagination of the jury to understand that girls can be capable of all sexual activity at variable young age. This young age, if the

current societies have delineated as having an exact number of child/adult, cannot be superimposed for the last x 1000's of years. If 3000 years ago, a girl was considered a "woman" for marriage purposes at the onset of a biologically visible event, but was a "child" for reference to their interests in that society (dolls as an example), why the insistence today that they also should have got their driving licenses at 18? Even today, a 14 year-old-guy can have sex with another 14 year old girl, but if the guy was 25, it is taken as statutory rape. But that by itself does not mean that the girl did not have sex or was incapable in every other way as far as biological performance goes. Statutory rape is also imposed by western societies for a whole number of reasons, but once again, to impose this on each and every society past and present, is the prosecutor's own shock value at work.

Now if the current western societies wish to invoke the "child" concept up to the age of 18, the defense submits that yes this is necessary today to keep a lot of things within some measurement, and absence of this will pose huge problems today. But to take this 18 year rule and also impose it around the world today and 1400 years ago is subject to the bias of the reader of this defense. Now one may argue that the one of sources quoted earlier says "child", but then the defense wants to invoke that the other source says "girl of 9". Hence, it can be reasonably inferred regardless of girl or child used, at least the implied inclusion of a biological change, namely the woman cycle, is present. Which then also means that the girl is physically capable of a sex act and also then capable of reproducing. If also you took additional changes into account, as I have said before, some 12 year olds today have all the characteristics of a grown woman. Since there are not a lot of convincing pictures of Ayesha when she was 10 or 11 or 15, for the prosecutor to imagine that she was of some limited capability when it came to being a "woman", then also is subject to the prosecutor's own bias as it relates to girls, and

maybe somehow reflective of the prosecutor's sexual code of acceptance. However, this aspect I am not sure of, hence I take back my own words about the sexual bias of the prosecutor.

Hence, in the interest of Ayesha, I am not sure if at 12 she actually was not in all respects a "full" woman. She very well could have been. And could have had genuine feelings of desire, together with the emotional makeup to maintain a home. (Side note: I have a sister who recently married at the age of 20. Between 13 and about the time she married, I really didn't see much of a difference in her, if you know what I am referring to. My family waited for a proper match, but she was just as much of a "woman" at 14 as she is now)

Hence for the prosecutor to give reference to Ayesha as a girl, incapable of sexual activity and immature to the point of not being capable of deciphering right from wrong at her marriage "consummation" day, the defense needs absolute proof. Just the use of "girl" or "child" of 9 or 11 or 12, is not sufficient for the worldwide jury to accept the prosecutor's version of what a 12-year-old girl can and cannot do sexually and emotionally. Women are very capable at young ages too, and to give them some kind of a "stupid" syndrome, especially if a girl is predisposed to "grow up" fast due to genetics or other factors, underestimating them. If the prosecutor finds it personally offensive that a 12-year-old girl can have sex, then that statement needs to be made explicitly. Otherwise lumping all 12-year-olds of the world into the same exact category, and passing a judgement, without regard to those girl's biological or mental makeup, ESPECIALLY of the desert climate and land of 1400 years ago, is also hereby rejected by the defense as a statement of personal bias and motive as it relates to sexual activity in girls.

It is understood that at first any news or story of 10 – 13 year old girls creates a mental picture of a small thin girl who is

“babyish”, but looking around me, I can present the jury with enough examples of girls who are capable. We as a western society obviously want to think in the best way possible, but the world is not just in the west. So reality of it all is also important.

Hence for the defense to proceed further on the sexual aspect of 10 or 12 year olds, the prosecutor will have to admit to the following:

“I, Ali Sina, hereby declare under penalty of perjury, that I find no reason to believe that a young girl of 10 11 or 12, and for purpose of clarity, a “young girl”, is incapable of having sexual orientation or the mental makeup to be a wife of any man, across the globe, of times both past and present, inclusive of the time period of 2000 years ago. Further, that I invoke that 18 years be accepted as the legal age of marriage of Ancient Arabia, and any digression or violation of this, by any man of any tribe of that time, renders that marriage null and void, and any children produced as a result and their descendants, are in my view, illegitimate. If I wish to alter my minimum age limit downwards to accommodate the customs of Ancient Arabia, I hereby then agree that a downward acceptable limit that the defense may impose, which may be lower than what I will come up with, be also as applicable. The minimum age limit, then having been disagreed, I will make a public statement that the minimum age of marriage of Ancient Arabia is a nonconclusive issue, and I will then not invoke any source or my personal opinion as to what the age of Ayesha should have been at time of her alleged consummation of marriage with the defendant. Also, I will further bring documented proof that no girl of even present times, even with the legalities of societies imposed, under the age of 14 has had sex with a male, in the United States of America.”

If Mr Sina makes this claim on the homepage of the website, then the defense will have to make counterpoints to that also. But

if the statement is not made publicly, on grounds of difference of opinion, then the minimum age of a girl capable of being a wife of any man, prophet or not, is inconclusive, and since is subject to the bias and opinion of the prosecutor and the age then subject to the sensibilities of the reader based on some personal sexual orientation, any derisive reference of it will be removed from the case.

Also, since the four elements that the defense presented necessary for pedophilia to exist, and for the prosecutor having presented no convincing supporting document in establishing the 4 elements in combination, and that the source used to establish the age by the prosecutor are a source of disagreement and debate for the jury of which muslims are also a sizeable portion, the prosecutor will have to remove all references of pedophilia also from the website. If such mentioning is allowed to continue, the jury should request decisive proof about the existence of all 4 elements for pedophilia as the defendant is accused of, and failure to do so, will render the issue as a matter of bias, and not rooted in sound logic.

Ali Sina to Raheel Shahzad

Mr. Shahzad begins this session by stating that the morality and framework of the societies of other ages should not be compared to that of today. Otherwise, as he states, one could find the founding fathers of America guilty of impropriety as well.

This argument is already discussed and there is no reason to linger over it anymore. However it is important to mention that although some of the founding fathers of America had slaves they are not guilty of the horrendous crimes perpetrated by the defendant. They are not guilty of rape, of mass murder, of genocide, of looting, of assassination, of deceit and misreprese-

ntation, of amassing wealth through reducing free people into slavery and selling them or other numerous crimes of which the defendant is accused with. Furthermore the founding fathers of America did not made bogus claims of being the mouthpiece of God on Earth, "a good example" to follow or having "sublime morals", as the defendant did. Those men were honest people who were born in a time when the consciousness of the humanity was not yet awakened. They did the best they could and what they proposed gave birth to a better and fairer society where the rule of law is respected and justice prevails.

The defendant on the other hand followed the examples of the people he called ignorant and set an example far worse than his contemporaries and justified the most heinous means with some bogus ends. He gave birth to a society that is violent, anti democratic, backward, bigoted and that is doomed to remain in perpetual misery.

The founding fathers of America opened the doors of freedom to the people and helped them march in the pursuit of their happiness and prosperity and excel all other nations of the world. While the followers of Muhammad are imprisoned and shackled in the dark dungeons of ignorance, fanaticism, irrationality and blind faith and are sliding farther and farther away from prosperity and happiness for a false promise of an afterlife.

The results speak volumes. In just about two centuries America has become the undisputed superpower of the world without subduing and enslaving any other country. Yet fourteen centuries later the benighted followers of Muhammad are immersed in poverty and are infested with miseries that surround them from every direction.

The so-called "Golden Age of Islam" was achieved because Muslims plundered the financial and the intellectual wealth of the countries that they conquered leaving behind a trail of death

and devastation. And as soon as that wealth was devoured the Islamic world plunged into poverty, as it proved to be incapable to advance, produce or keep pace with the changing times.

The defense makes an attempt to dismiss the authority of the Hadith and states:

“Here's the problem with the collection of sources (which are not divine and not construed as such by muslims collectively, they are historical accounts meant for the guidance of people today, who also have the collective authority to conclude the relevance of certain portions in today's world, and if some society wishes to take a hardline attitude, in respect of that, then it also is a problem for the societies which accepted it in the first place)”.

The hadith is the collection of stories of the life and the sayings of Muhammad. They are the aid to understanding the Quran. Mr. Shahzad affirms that many of the hadiths are irrelevant in this day and age and if a society follows those sayings and the examples of Muhammad as they are noted in hadith, or as he puts it, *“takes a hardline attitude in respect of that”*, that is the problem of that society.

I would like to ask Mr. Shahzad to explain how a society or an individual would know which hadiths to follow and which ones not to.

What would you say to a Muslim who thinks women are deficient in intelligence or black dogs are to be killed as devils because he has read these in some hadiths? Would you tell him that he got it all wrong and those hadiths are no more applicable? Can you please tell me why he should believe in you? What authority you have to decide which hadiths are to be followed and which ones are outdated? What is your standard of right and wrong? Are you going to judge the Sirat and sunnah of the Prophet with the values of the secular and the kafir world?

We are facing a dilemma. Quran without the hadith is gibberish. It is the hadith that sheds light on the real meaning of the Quran. Then we have Mr. Shahzad telling us that following the hadith is a problem. He says that the society collectively can decide which hadiths are to be followed and which ones should be jettisoned. I would like him to explain to us the mechanism by which one billion plus believers can come together and decide which hadiths are no more valid and should be discarded. The truth is that in practice we have no such mechanism in place and changing the hadith or the Quran is not possible. One can decide to disregard parts of those books, but there is no authority that can make that a universal requirement of faith. We certainly cannot stop the Mullahs or the Muslim terrorists who wish to choose the violent teachings of those books as the source of their guidance. In fact Islam is divided in hundreds of sects each calling others heretics, precisely because each person chooses some hadiths and rejects others and interprets the Quran as he pleases.

Coming back to the case of **pedophilia** of which the defendant is accused, the defense harangues in length that in some places Aisha is said to be six and in some other place she is said to be seven and then concludes that since the texts on the age of Aisha differ, they are "inconclusive" and are not to be trusted at all. Therefore he suggests that Aisha could have been much older when she was given in marriage to the defendant.

He writes: *"If 9 or 10 can be read, then 10 or 11 or 12 can be read without being logically completely out of the range being addressed and context"*.

And carries on saying: *"By some scholars, they come to even 14 also as the age"*.

The defense goes on to demand that the prosecutor produce: Aisha's medical records, birth certificate, marriage certificate, a

certificate of his physical makeup as one of a girl not having reached puberty, a certificate that she had not experienced menses at time of the consummation of marriage and other similar absurd demands.

The prosecutor gives some credit to Mr. Shahzad who obviously realizes that marrying a child of 9 years of age is unethical and hence tries to prove that Aisha was actually older than what the hadiths say. However, those attempts are feeble. There are many hadiths that clearly state Aisha was 6 when she was betrothed to Muhammad and she was 9 when he married her and consummated his marriage with her.

Sahih Muslim Book 008, Number 3310: *Aisha (Allah be pleased with her) reported: Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) married me when I was **six years old**, and I was admitted to his house when I was nine years old.*

Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 64 Narrated *'Aisha: that the Prophet married her when she was **six years old** and he consummated his marriage when she was nine years old, and then she remained with him for nine years (i.e., till his death).*

Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 65 Narrated *'Aisha: that the Prophet married her when she was **six years old** and he consummated his marriage when she was nine years old. Hisham said: I have been informed that 'Aisha remained with the Prophet for nine years (i.e. till his death)." what you know of the Quran (by heart)'*

Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 88 Narrated *'Ursa: The Prophet wrote the (marriage contract) with 'Aisha while she was **six years old** and consummated his marriage with her while she was nine years old and she remained with him for nine years (i.e. till his death).*

Some Muslims claim that it was Abu Bakr who approached Muhammad asking him to marry his daughter. This is of course not true and here is the proof.

Sahih Bukhari 7.18 Narrated 'Ursa: The Prophet asked Abu Bakr for 'Aisha's hand in marriage. Abu Bakr said "But I am your brother." The Prophet said, "You are my brother in Allah's religion and His Book, but she (Aisha) is lawful for me to marry."

Arabs were a primitive lot with little rules to abide. Yet they had some code of ethics that they honored scrupulously. For example, although they fought all the year round, they abstained from hostilities during certain holy months of the year. They also considered Mecca to be a holy city and did not make war against it. An adopted son's wife was deemed to be a daughter in law and they would not marry her. Also it was customary that close friends make a pact of brotherhood and consider each other as true brothers. The Prophet disregarded all of these rules anytime they stood between him and his convenience and whims.

Abu Bakr and Muhammad had pledged to each other to be brothers. So according to their customs Aisha was supposed to be like a niece to Muhammad. Yet that did not stop him to ask her hand for marriage even when she was only six years old.

Interestingly, this moral relativist Prophet would use the same excuse to reject a woman who was not young and pretty enough for him.

Sahih Bukhari V.7, B62, N. 37 Narrated Ibn 'Abbas: It was said to the Prophet, "Won't you marry the daughter of Hamza?" He said, "She is my foster niece (brother's daughter). "

Hamza and Abu Bakr both were the foster brothers of Muhammad. But Aisha must have been too pretty for the Prophet to abide by the codes of ethics and customs.

In the following Hadith Muhammad confided to Aisha that he had dreamed of her before soliciting her from her father.

Sahih Bukhari 9.140 Narrated 'Aisha: Allah's Apostle said to me, "You were shown to me twice (in my dream) before I married you. I saw an angel carrying you in a silken piece of cloth, and I said to him, 'Uncover (her),' and behold, it was you. I said (to myself), 'If this is from Allah, then it must happen.' Then you were shown to me, the angel carrying you in a silken piece of cloth, and I said (to him), 'Uncover (her), and behold, it was you. I said (to myself), 'If this is from Allah, then it must happen.' "

Whether Muhammad had actually such dream or he just said it to please Aisha and make her believe this has been the will of God is not the point. What matters here is that it indicates that Aisha was a baby being “carried” by an angel when the Prophet dreamed of her.

Here are some more hadiths that explicitly reveal the age of Aisha at the time of her marriage.

*Sahih Bukhari 5.236 Narrated Hisham's father: Khadija died three years before the Prophet departed to Medina. He stayed there for two years or so and then he married 'Aisha when she was a girl of **six years of age**, and he **consumed that marriage when she was nine years old**.*

*Sahih Bukhari 5.234 Narrated Aisha: The Prophet engaged me when I was a girl of **six (years)**. We went to Medina and stayed at the home of Bani-al-Harith bin Khazraj. Then I got ill and my hair fell down. Later on my hair grew (again) and my mother, Um Ruman, came to me while **I was playing in a swing** with some of my girl friends. She called me, and I went to her, not knowing what she wanted to do to me. She caught me by the hand and made me stand at the door of the house. I was breathless then, and when my breathing became All right, she took some water and rubbed my face and head with it. Then she*

*took me into the house. There in the house I saw some Ansari women who said, "Best wishes and Allah's Blessing and a good luck." Then she entrusted me to them and they prepared me (for the marriage). Unexpectedly Allah's Apostle came to me in the forenoon and my mother handed me over to him, and at that time **I was a girl of nine years of age.***

Only in one hadith the age is said to be "seven or six".

Sunan Abu-Dawud Book 41, Number 4915, also Number 4915 and Number 4915

*Narrated Aisha, Ummul Muminin: The Apostle of Allah (peace be upon him) married me when **I was seven or six.** When we came to Medina, some women came. According to Bishr's version: Umm Ruman came to me when **I was swinging.** They took me, made me prepared and decorated me. I was then brought to the Apostle of Allah (peace be upon him), and **he took up cohabitation with me when I was nine.** She halted me at the door, and I burst into laughter.*

In the above hadith we read that Aisha was playing in a swing. This is a play of little girls not grown up people. The above hadith also clearly mentions that the defendant took up cohabitation with Aisha when she was nine. And the age here is described as six or seven.

Six or seven are really the same. We often do not recall at what exact age things happened to us. So saying six or seven means six or seven and not ten or twelve or may be fourteen as the defense insinuates.

The following Hadith is particularly interesting because it shows that Aisha was so small that she was not aware what was going on when the Holy Prophet "surprised" her by going to her in that very morning that she was brought to his house.

Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 90

*Narrated Aisha: When the Prophet married me, my mother came to me and made me enter the house (of the Prophet) and **nothing surprised me but the coming of Allah's Apostle to me in the forenoon.***

Must have been quite a surprise!

Another important hadith is the following which shows Aisha was just a kid playing with her dolls. Pay attention to what the commentator wrote in the parenthesis. *(She was a little girl, not yet reached the age of puberty)*

Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 73, Number 151

*Narrated Aisha: **I used to play with the dolls** in the presence of the Prophet, and my girl friends also used to play with me. When Allah's Apostle used to enter (my dwelling place) they used to hide themselves, but the Prophet would call them to join and play with me. (The playing with the dolls and similar images is forbidden, but it was allowed for 'Aisha at that time, **as she was a little girl, not yet reached the age of puberty.**) (Fateh-al-Bari page 143, Vol.13)*

The prosecutor therefore submits the above exhibit in lieu of the birth certificate and other absurd demands made by the defense. Aisha was a child who used to play with dolls and at swing and had **not yet reached the age of puberty**. No medical records or certificates are needed when we have proofs such as the above.

Sahih Muslim Book 008, Number 3311

*Aisha (Allah be pleased with her) reported that Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) married her when she was seven years old, and he was taken to his house as a bride when she was nine, and her **dolls** were with her; and when he (the Holy Prophet) died she was eighteen years old.*

Khadija the first wife of Muhammad died in December, 619. By then Muhammad who was born in 570 AD was 49 (close to 50) years old by Gregorian calendar and 51 years old by lunar calendar. (Lunar year is 11 days shorter than solar year) Two months after the death of Khadija Muhammad married Sawda and at the same time he betrothed Aisha. Three years later, he consummated his marriage with Aisha who was just 9 years old.

Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 73, Number 33

Narrated 'Aisha: I never felt so jealous of any woman as I did of Khadija, though she had died three years before the Prophet married me.

In another part Aisha claims that as long as she remembers her parents were always Muslims.

Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 58, Number 245 *Narrated 'Aisha: (the wife of the Prophet) I never remembered my parents believing in any religion other than the true religion (i.e. Islam),*

This too is yet another proof that Aisha was born to Abu Bakr and his wife after they both had converted to Islam. Hence she could not have been more than nine or ten when she married the defendant.

The defendant goes on to question the meaning of consummation and states that the prosecutor is forcing upon the jury his own meaning.

Mr. Shahbaz writes: *“Furthermore, ‘consummation’ as having meant sexual intercourse, here is being forced upon the jury also. The defense is not disputing that consummation cannot mean intercourse, but prosecutor has provided no evidence that consummation to a 12 year-old”.*

The prosecution makes no such attempt to force any meaning other than what the word implies. However such an excuse is

only indicative to what length the defense is ready to go to mask the truth and deny the facts.

The defense states that “consummation” could mean different things and perhaps what Aisha meant by consummation meant something else.

Consummation means only one thing. Even if it meant different things as the defense is suggesting, we have no way to say what kind of consummation took place. Even if we assume that consummation in this case could mean fondling, as the same Aisha reported Muhammad used to do with his wives, fondling a little girl is pedophilia. It is despicable, shameful, disgusting and abhorrent. The fact that Aisha was “surprised” of Muhammad “coming” to her, is clear indication that she was not psychologically prepared to handle the situation and did not know what was going on. Whether the beguiled Abu Bakr consented to her 9-year-old child be fondled or raped by a 54-year-old man or whether the ignorant society of that time did not consider pedophilia to be a crime does not absolve Muhammad of this crime. A man who claimed to possess “sublime morals” and a good example to follow should not have set such a poor example. He should have known better.

The defense then goes on to give his own definition of pedophilia and set four criteria for it. He then states that based on those criteria the defendant is not a pedophile.

The prosecutor will not attempt to give a definition of his own but rather calls the testimony of the experts:

According to **Dictionary.com**, Pedophilia is: The act or fantasy on the part of an adult of engaging in sexual activity with a child or children.

According to **Paul A. Gore**, Ph.D. of the University of Missouri-Kansas City: Pedophilia involves reoccurring sexual arousal and desires or fantasies involving sexual impulses toward

a pre-adolescent child or children. The pedophile must be above age 16, and the sexual attraction must involve a child of age 13 or younger who is at least 5 years younger than the adult. A pedophile has either acted on these sexual impulses, or the fantasies and / or sexual arousal and impulses disturb the individual. The pedophile is sexually aroused because the child is a child, regardless of the pedophile's sexual orientation, or the child's gender.

Therefore one does not need to have intercourse to be a pedophile. Even having sexual fantasies with a child of age 13 or younger is pedophilia.

Muhammad was 54 when he had sex with Aisha who was then just 9 years old. By all definitions this is pedophilia. The actual penetration is not necessary to happen in order to call what the defendant did pedophilia. Social acceptability or not is not a valid excuse. The societies of the past used to be ignorant and savages. In many societies human sacrifice was normal and in some societies even cannibalism was practiced. That is no reason to believe such acts were good at any time and a prophet of such people who practiced those heinous acts could also be a true prophet. Muhammad claimed to be a messenger of God. He claimed to have come to guide the mankind to the right path. He said he is setting an example for everyone to follow. Even if pedophilia was rampant in his time, he should not have done it.

With moral relativity clause, we could possibility acquit anyone who is born and raised in a society that does not frown on pedophilia. Although, even that is arguable. But we cannot forgive a man who claimed to be a guide to the rest of mankind when in reality he followed the vices of the most ignorant people of his time and set a bad example for the posterity and other people who did not have those vices. The evil perpetrated by an average man is limited to his own sphere of actions. The evil of a

man who lies and deceives others claiming to be a messenger of God and then sets such a perverse example, affects billions of people and in fact to all mankind.

Today we are not here to condemn Muhammad but to set free those who believe he is an example to follow. I hope that Muslims who seek the truth can see that they have been duped by an impostor and that following such an evil monster is no way to heaven. Unless Allah is devil, no real God would send a man of such low moral character as the guide to mankind.

The defense continues: *“Since the prophet’s marriage does not have any convincing source or criticism by the thinkers, writers or intellectuals of 1400 years ago, or even 1200 years ago, then it has to be accepted that marriage to young girls was an acceptable act and did not rupture the moral fabric of that time”*.

Although I do not have any document showing that marriage to a 9-year-old, 1400 years ago was prohibited, I do not know of any historic document showing that marriages to children that young were allowed either. I doubt a civilized people as the Persians practiced such thing.

Anyway, we are not here to change the past but the present. Today many young girls in Iran and other Islamic countries become victimized by this barbaric Sunnah (tradition, example) of Muhammad. Today, in many countries marriage to children younger than 14 and 15 is prohibited and is severely punished as statutory rape. Yet in most Islamic countries this barbaric tradition lingers. The reason given is that it is the Sunnah of the Prophet and hence it must be respected and preserved. The prevalent attitude is that "Allah knows best".

The Guardian Council of Iran, made of 12 clerics, vetoed a bill to raise the legal age for girls marrying from 9 to 12, or the bill to allow unmarried girls to travel abroad for their studies.

Such bills would have undermined the law of Sharia. In Iran 9-year-old girls can be prosecuted and put to death because according to the Sunnah they are considered to be adults. If they are good for marriage and sex then they should be good for prosecution too.

Therefore, it is irrelevant whether the people of 1400 years ago were shocked or not. What is disturbing is that the Muslims, even in this day and age are not shocked by what Muhammad did. What concerns us is that this barbaric law is practiced today in many Islamic countries and as long as Islam is deemed to be superior to secular (western) laws, the violence against children will not end.

We cannot uphold Muhammad as a messenger of God, "an honorable prophet", "an example to follow" and then tell people do not follow his examples. This hypocrisy must stop. You either believe that what Muhammad did is right and the world should follow him now and forever, or stop calling him a good example for mankind to follow.

Can you tell me at what time in the last 1400 years Muhammad was a good example to follow? Can you point out one society who had a moral standard lower than that of Muhammad? Which society benefited by following his examples?

The defense gives a lengthy explanation to prove that in some cases some girls mature faster and it is possible that some girls could reach puberty at the age of nine.

As we saw in one of the above hadiths, Aisha at the time of her marriage *"was a little girl, not yet reached the age of puberty"*. So even if what the defense claims could be true in some exceptional cases, it does not apply to Aisha. Yet we are not concerned about Aisha but the implications of this and other examples set by Muhammad. Millions of girls, whether reached

puberty or not, were raped and are continued to be raped because of what Muhammad did 1400 years ago. And that is a tragedy that must be stopped.

Whether some girls in some areas can reach puberty at 9 is no excuse to set a law that could potentially deflower and scar psychologically and even physiologically millions of little girls who have reached the age of 9.

Therefore, I plead to the Jury, both Muslims and non Muslims, to unanimously condemn the defendant Muhammad bin Abdullah, for setting this bad example and find him guilty of pedophilia. I urge my Muslim brothers and sisters in humanity to not let bigotry come between them and justice. If there is a God, be assured that he is on the side of justice. So be just and think whether you would like a 54 year old man fondle or have sex with your own 9 year old daughter. Even if you disagree with everything I say, you must agree that what Muhammad did to Aisha was indecent and unethical. What would be your judgment if, not Muhammad but someone else was on trial for the same crime? What would you say if a 54 year old Mullah took a 9-year-old girl to bed? Even if you love Muhammad, you must condemn this act. Otherwise how can you look in the mirror and not be ashamed of your own inhumanity?

Ali Sina

Part VII

Lewdness, Immorality, indecency and promiscuity

Dec. 03, 2003

The defense will now tackle the issue of the sexual orientation in light of the multiple marriages of the defendant, and since the objection over the age of one of the wives has already been discussed above, Ayesha will be included as the lawfully wedded

wife of the defendant, together with the others he had married. According to popular sources, he may have married as many as 13 women. (More if other obscure sources are also taken)

Mr Sina, allow me to change my tone to more informal now.

Why have you somehow perceived the prophet as not a man who had sexual desires just like any other man of today's time? (we know there are exceptions, but that's another debate). Do you somehow wish that for a man to be chosen a prophet, he had to first be not sexual at all? Or is it your conviction that he should not enjoy sex with his wife just like another man is allowed to? If the defendant wished to have privacy and enjoy his wife's company, why is such a big concern of yours? Are you somehow elevating him to the point that for you to have accepted him, he should have had no sexual desire or activity whatsoever?

Even the most moral men these days can enjoy their wife's body in the privacy of their homes, and a woman has the full right to enjoy her husband too, as long as the wife is not compelled or forced into any situation (and I'll address this aspect separately because you may invoke some Quranic verse here, but I think I know the one you will use). Having sex multiple times by itself does not make a marriage full of lust. Neither does the desire for having sex with different women over the course of a man's life make it automatically immoral. A person's own sexual view of the world can make even the simple act be viewed as having been done for lust. And why is it such a big deal if a man has lust for his wife? Is a man and woman not allowed to have lust for each other's body in the confines of privacy?

Also, you actually have witnessed yourself that each marriage actually has sex as part of it? A marriage cannot be a marriage of

convenience for the society, or to achieve some good? If you went out today and married a girl/woman, it's compulsory on you that you need to have sex too 90 times each day? So you actually have absolutely proofs that the defendant actually had each marriage to perform the act, and there was no chance absolutely that the marriages could have been in deed and not for the reasons you think they happened? Just like I cannot provide proof that he didn't "do" it, you also cannot provide the proof that he actually did. You may bring those sources that list his manly prowess as that of x-number of men, and that he visited each house every night, you actually have pictures of the acts? And so did all the scholars? You have detailed accounts of each one of his marriages actually being his bodily desire? You in one article go at length about his marriage to his adopted son's wife. And you actually have proof that this was a marriage that produced some body outcome? There's no room for the idea that in a complex time and state of affairs, that there could have been something else at work and the woman's protection was desirable? You may take all these hypotheticals and invoke a gazillion books and sources and say that I am apologizing, and I am not. I'm asking you if you have proof that all 13 marriages (or more) actually had no other socially relevant aspect except for the conclusion you have made. If 300 scholars come together, they still cannot convince me that there was sex involved in each marriage. It all depends on what a person's disposition is and how you learn a subject matter. In the absence of photo albums and other videos of 1400 years ago, I'm supposed to infer as an imbecile that 13 marriages equal 13 ejaculations in 8 hours. If one has to obviously find all the text and infer lust, then you have satisfied yourself. And if I want to read all the same sources and infer that there's probably more than one way of looking at this, then I have satisfied myself too. All the salacious stories are predisposed to bring out a person in a certain light anyway.

Anyway, the point is that privacy of bedrooms rarely gets exposed. And a marriage may not have the automatic element that you want to find. You will give references of his marriage on whims.. etc.. I have read all of them. And I can present all of them to you with the same words but come to a different conclusion within norms of reasoning.

But if you MUST insist on him being very interested in sex, then I'll continue along those lines:

Consider the present day situation. Millions of men in USA even today may go through as many as 8 to 10 women with whom they have had sexual relations. Many boys these days start sexual activity at 15 or 16, and by the time they are 60, may have been with various women. This of course is not looked by mainstream America today as an anomaly or injurious to the moral fabric of USA. Men today, regardless of who they are with, are genuine partners in that relationship, and sex is just one aspect of it. Girls have boyfriends in high school, teen pregnancy is fairly common, and even many Christian men may have many sexual experiences throughout their life. The same men today hold places of responsibility and their moral code is not challenged, regardless of them having had 30 partners through course of life. Even Bill Clinton succumbed to the lust aspect, but that didn't stop people from viewing him as President. If some war had happened after the Monica Lewinsky fiasco, soldiers still would have taken him to be Commander In Chief, and soldiers would have been willing to die for the country and cause at the direction of Bill Clinton. At some point, his discretion with a girl did not really tarnish his position to the point where he just could not lead a nation. All kept things in perspective and he served 2 terms in office. And not only he, presidents of the past also didn't have many problems keeping their women and the leadership as separate ideals. JFK's

tendencies are not hidden, yet he is one of the most revered people today.

You have also objected to his marriage at advanced age and then referred all his marriages (especially that to Ayesha) in that context too. The defense finds that extremely odd, given the sexual freedom and medical advances of western nations. Defense submits “Viagra” as one of the exhibits that is being used today to prolong the sexual cycle of aging men. And the jury can itself find plenty of over 50 men all over the world who want to enjoy sex in a marriage. Some men, even without marriage, still want to feel vibrant about their bodies well into their later years. So if the defendant wanted to continue to feel vibrant sexually into his 50’s, why is he being prosecuted so hard by the prosecutor? Hence, if I understand Mr. Sina’s position, then I guess all 50 year-olds who want to have sex within a marriage are immoral, just as the defendant is being accused. The age difference between the man and woman is not for the prosecutor to decide, but for the world jury. If a 50-year-old wanting to marry a 20-year-old girl and trying to have a family; is obscene to the prosecutor, then as a matter of principle, the defense would like to ask the prosecutor to make another declaration here. Using this standard, if the prosecutor will find the defendant guilty, the defense then reserves the right to make inferences from the declaration at a later point in this case:

“I, Ali Sina, hereby declare under penalty of perjury that I find it totally acceptable and obscene that a man of over 50 years of age should have sex or have feelings of love for any woman, old or young, in any society, past or present or future, and that such man, if ever having been documented of practicing polygamy or having married more than once, or having sexual desires of any kind for anyone, male or female, shall be declared deficient in all other regards, for having displayed a normal bodily desire to engage in sex. I further declare that it is counter

to any accepted norms of any time for a man of that age to have been involved in fondling his wife within the privacy of his house, and if the man is found guilty of any of these, then he be rendered incapable of leading any nation, company, or any group of people, on account of having a morally deficient code, unworthy of any consideration, and downright insane. This statement shall apply to all men of all races, past present and future, and to all men who have claimed themselves as prophets too. I further declare that any US President, past present or future, if documented to have had sex at an advanced age, and the word advanced to mean 53 according to me, shall be impeached in the congress and declared mentally insane. If sex is committed with a slave, or with a girl who I will define as not of age because the society has no real legal statute for the definition of young or child, then this man be not considered morally fit. I also as the leader of this mission, hereby declare that whoever agrees to my mission and is above 50 years of age and will have sex with his wife or wives over the course of time, will not be considered part of the mission anymore, on grounds of being immoral. If the over 50-person ever married more than three times, he would be rendered insane by FFI. Since this mission is lynching a man 1400 years ago for having married many women and having been a sexually active person after 50, no missionary of FFI will ever be found of having similar moral fortitude”

Now of course you will invoke that a prophet is above all this and should have had the moral fortitude to have rejected sex in the name of God or a cause. And I would have to ask again.. WHY? What does a person's sexual orientation, or his desire for sex, or desire to have various women, have to do with being a leader? Even if you forget the prophet aspect totally, just on the basis of him being a leader, if people today 1400 years later can keep the message and the person separate (People vs. Clinton),

what makes you think that the defendant's leadership was undermined just because he had 12 wives? And why are you employing the double standard of lynching the defendant on account of him being an unfit leader, but still are mentally capable today of living in a country where sexual freedom is so near and dear to many. If you yourself were told that you could not marry more than once EVER, and that during one month you could only have sex once, would that moral code be acceptable to you? And if not, why should the defendant be judged as a leader for having had sex more than once in the same night (according to some sources). So it's OK 1400 years later for men to be leaders and have sex even outside marriage, but it should have been a taboo 1400 years ago for a man to want to enjoy sex. I just don't understand this double standard at all that you are displaying so eloquently throughout your site. I further read on the site, through invocation of various sources, that the defendant had the manliness of 10 (or more) men. And then I wonder, ok so how does that mean that he was any less of a moral man. In fact, I wonder why he had the manliness of 10 men, why not 10,000? Many men probably wish they could perform as one man, let alone 10. And maybe the wives and girlfriends can shed some more light on this, cos I'm a guy, and I'm not 100% sure about the manliness aspect today. And so if someone is capable of performing at the strength of 10 men as it relates to a wife in a marriage, how is the prosecutor equating that to deficiency in moral fortitude. In fact, maybe being a man 1400 years ago was proven by how much a person can actually perform, because without this prowess, maybe the society 1400 years ago just did not really take that leader seriously. Maybe wimps were just not in fashion, and hence to continue to demonstrate to society that a man is endowed with a natural power to perform at home was an important aspect of being a leader. If today the qualities of leadership have shifted with time, is it now the responsibility of

ancient civilizations to come back and cry over it? If today the western societies have morally allowed men to perform in bed without the necessity of any marriage contract and perform it with zeal and vigor and even display it openly on TV and movies, well how do the men 1400 years ago fare in comparison? The only difference I find is the absence of marriages then, because otherwise the acts are fairly similar. So all men 1400 years ago, prophet or not, if we found today to have engaged in sex totally outside of marriage, will that improve the defendant's case? And let's even go further, by your own conclusion, you have accused the defendant of performing outside of marriage too. And that STILL is wrong according to your conclusion. So you are indecisive in your own conclusion. They're damned if they do within marriage, and damned if they do without, so in essence, they should just not have had any desire of sex whatsoever, which I wonder how we even exist 1400 years later, if every man 1400 years ago was supposed to be celibate.

If the vast majority of Muslim men are just not judged anymore on basis of how many wives they have and how much "manliness" they possess, why do you want to impose on them that they SHOULD. If someone is in fact marrying more than once in rural areas, well there are more factors involved than just reading Hadees and following Quran. Polygamy in western societies has not been eradicated, so why do you insist it be eradicated from every other place? There's a way of bringing about the change in attitude in rural areas, but denouncing a 1400-year-old practice probably will not yield the result there.

In effect what you have done is you have first developed your own moral code, of which the sexual aspect has a certain ideal. Then you have raised the bar even further for the defendant. And now you have made him somehow above the need for sexual activity. To you, the defendant probably had to be a eunuch for him to even have a bit of credibility. Hence, any atheist today

can be gay, bisexual, have 15 sexual encounters in a year, or even a week, and basically have total sexual freedom. Yet then you restrict the leadership of a different ideology to only one woman? Why are you being unfair to yourself and the jury? For the same sexual freedom that people fight today, where even a gay priest can now be part of a church in USA, you somehow in your mind want the prophet to be limited by your own standard. Why? I have already addressed his multiple marriage issue, and also the age of one of the wives that your site so vehemently objects to, but for argument's sake, let's say all his wives were over 30, would that have been ok for you? Can he get some respect then? In fact, he displayed the same sexual freedom 1400 years ago that you and I see being fought for practiced today in a free country. And you say that he was ancient?

You also then insist that he married for lust, and even if someone took that to be the case, **HE STILL MARRIED!** Can you say that about a lot of Christian men today? So single moms I guess, is your ideal situation? About 45% African American women mothers are single (you can research, I'm giving estimate). So should I then start blaming all this on lustful behaviors?

But it's actually not really your or my fault. With as much sex as we see around us in movies, TV, etc, it's not tough to find lust quickly. I read ALL your articles and read the versions of Orientalists, Apologists, etc... And I keep thinking, where do you all hide the pictures of bedrooms from 1400 years ago? Whether an apologist or Syed Kamran Mirza or whoever else, the defense wants access to the pictures all of you have been hiding.

But back to a more reasonable discourse.

People dislike polygamy. Agreed. But that's like a technicality in today's environment. If a man is married and had sex

with 2 women in same day, then it's polygamy. If a 21 year old in USA has sex with 4 different girls during one year, then that's ok. Fine. You can continue to invoke this technicality. To me it just doesn't appeal at all.

That's not to say that I have some hidden agenda against sex in USA. But for me to view the marriages of the defendant, even by today's western standards, don't seem that big of a deal, and neither to a good portion of the muslims who just do not emulate this aspect, no matter how much you want to believe it. I never view him as a man who should have been devoid of any sexual desire. That's why in Part1; I invoked the definition of "Human". He was a human first. Then he was a prophet. And you want him to have had the sexual fortitude of a celibate monk!

The defense then rests on the case of his multiple marriages, the inconclusiveness of his very young wife's exact age and the absence of any objection at that age of marriage in historical records, the absence of all 4 elements of pedophilia, his image as a person who somehow was solely driven by sexual desires, and his age at time of marriages.

The defense hereby submits to the jury, that you view the case with all the reasonable judgement of an impartial group. If you are predisposed to the defendant being a certain way, and no amount of commonsense analysis is supposed to make any sense, then I have done what is humanly capable in giving you to consider. I did not even use sources or invoke Quran or any other scripture, Hadees or any scholar. I made an argument based purely on commonsense and with the same liberty that you and I fight for in free nations. If you want to ridicule the defendant and now find him guilty of the charges addressed by defense so far, of course then our commonsense is never going to meet. I hereby ask the jury to impart an unbiased decision, insofar as the charges of polygamy, pedophilia and sexual activity are

concerned, exhibited by the defendant as the normal traits that are found in men today of most countries. If you are incapable of doing so given all the reasons stated so far and your own conscience and intellectual capability, then I guess we can respectfully agree to disagree. Please note that I am not asking you to accept the ideology that the defendant fought for. If you find the defendant guilty of certain moral deficiency based on what the defense has addressed so far, then that also carries a lot of responsibility for you. Hence, the reader is urged to keep things in perspective.

As a certain adage goes: *“In disagreeing with the message, don’t shoot the messenger”*

In my next section, I will move to the case of the Quran as the objections raised here at FFI.

Thank you.

Shahzad

Dear Mr. Shahzad,

I am afraid you have missed the point of this trial. I am not accusing your client of being a sexual person. All of us humans are sexual beings as much as we are intellectual or spiritual beings. Sex is a function of us. This is what ensures the survival of our species. Sex is also a strong bond between a man and a woman who have to provide a loving and nurturing home for our future generations.

I am accusing your client of lewdness, impropriety, indecency, lustfulness and promiscuity.

Take the example of Mariyah. Mariyah was a maid of Hafsa, the daughter of Omar and one of the wives of Muhammad.

One day Muhammad goes to Hafsa’s house and upon setting gaze at her maid Mariyah, he finds her attractive and decides to

get laid. He sends Hafsa to Omar's house, telling her that her father wanted to see her (a lie). When Hafsa leaves, Muhammad takes Mariyah to bed and has intercourse with her. Meanwhile Hafsa, who finds out that her father was not expecting her, returns home much sooner than expected, and to her surprise finds her illustrious husband in bed with her maid.

She becomes hysteric and forgetting the station of the prophet she shouts and causes a scandal. The prophet pleads with her to calm down and promises not to sleep with Mariah again and bades her also not to divulge that secret to others.

Hafsa would not control herself and relays everything to Ayisha who also turns against the prophet and jointly with his other wives cause him much anguish. So the prophet decides to punish all of them by not sleeping with them for one month. Depriving one's wives sexually is the second step of punishment recommended in the Quran. The first step is admonishing them, the second step is depriving them of sex and the third step is beating them. [Q.4:34]

Of course when a Muslim man decides to punish a wife through sexual deprivation he still can satisfy his sexual urges with his other wives. However Muhammad was angry with all of his wives for having ganged up against him and on the spur of the moment he made the oath not to sleep with any of them for one month. That of course would have been too much hardship for the beloved messenger of God. Therefore God in his mercy comes to the aid of his prophet and reveals the Surah Tahrīm (Banning). In this Surah, Allah gently rebukes Muhammad for being so hard on himself and for depriving himself from what he really likes and has been made lawful to him, in order to please his wives.

The following is the text of this funny Surah: Q. 66:1-5.

1. O Prophet! Why do you ban (for yourself) that which Allâh has made lawful to you, seeking to please your wives? And Allâh is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful.

2. Allah has already ordained for you (O men), the dissolution of your oaths. And Allâh is your Maula (Lord, or Master, or Protector, etc.) and He is the All-Knower, the All-Wise.

3. And (remember) when the Prophet (SAW) disclosed a matter in confidence to one of his wives (Hafsah), so when she told it (to another i.e. Aisha), and Allâh made it known to him, he informed part thereof and left a part. Then when he told her (Hafsah) thereof, she said: "Who told you this?" He said: "The All-Knower, the All-Aware (Allâh) has told me".

4. If you two (wives of the Prophet SAW, namely 'Aisha and Hafsah) turn in repentance to Allâh, (it will be better for you), your hearts are indeed so inclined (to oppose what the Prophet SAW likes), but if you help one another against him (Muhammad SAW), then verily, Allâh is his Maula (Lord, or Master, or Protector, etc.), and Jibrael (Gabriel), and the righteous among the believers, and furthermore, the angels are his helpers.

5. It may be if he divorced you (all) that his Lord will give him instead of you, wives better than you, Muslims (who submit to Allâh), believers, obedient to Allâh, turning to Allâh in repentance, worshipping Allâh sincerely, fasting or emigrants (for Allah's sake), previously married and virgins. “

Comment:

Although Muhammad gave his word to Hafsa not to have sex with her maid, he could not resist the temptation. Especially now that he had taken another oath not to sleep with all of his wives. It was a difficult situation. On one hand he had to keep up his word or risk losing face and on the other he was not the kind of man that liked to deprive himself of pleasures. A solution had to

be found and no one but Allah could help him. Well, nothing is impossible when you are the prophet of Allah. Leave everything in the hands of the Almighty and let him take care of it. And that is exactly what Muhammad did. Allah himself intervened and gave his favorite prophet the green light to follow his heart's desire. In the Surah Tahrim God licensed his beloved prophet to have his fling and not pay attention to his wives. What can a prophet ask more? Allah was so concerned about Muhammad's carnal pleasures that he even allowed ALL MEN to break their oaths as a bounty. Subhanallah. Isn't Allah great?

It is also worthy of mention that Muhammad who came to know that Hafsa did reveal the secret to Aisha, **lied** to her by pretending that it was Allah who told him so (verse 3) while he actually learned it from Aisha.

In reaction to the above verses, Ayisha, who was not only young and pretty but also clever, is reported to have said to Muhammad, *"Your God indeed rushes in coming to your aid!"*

Explaining the Surah Tahrim (66) Omar is reported to have said:

Bukhari Volume 3, Book 43, Number 648:

The Prophet did not go to his wives because of the secret which Hafsa had disclosed to Aisha, and he said that he would not go to his wives for one month as he was angry with them when Allah admonished him (for his oath that he would not approach Mariyah).

This story must have been embarrassing for Muhammad's followers even when they gobbled mindlessly everything he told them. So they made other hadiths to explain those verses of the Quran that were already explained by Omar.

Sahih Muslim Book 009, Number 3496: Aisha (Allah be pleased with her) narrated that Allah's Apostle (may peace be

upon him) used to spend time with Zainab, daughter of Jahsh, and drank honey at her house. She (Aisha further) said: I and Hafsa agreed that one whom Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) would visit first should say: I notice that you have an odour of the Maghafir (gum of mimosa). He (the Holy Prophet) visited one of them and she said to him like this, whereupon he said: 'I have taken honey in the house of Zainab bint Jabsh and I will never do it again. It was at this (that the following verse was revealed): 'Why do you hold to be forbidden what Allah has made lawful for you... (up to). If you both (Aisha and Hafsa) turn to Allah" up to:" And when the Holy Prophet confided an information to one of his wives" (lxvi 3). This refers to his saying: But I have taken honey.

Also Sahih Muslim Book 009, Number 3497:

The existence of the above Hadith and its difference with the one narrated by Omar reveals yet another fact that the companions of Muhammad were willing to lie, (as Muslims are today) to preserve the image of their prophet from blemish. It would be foolish to accept the excuse of drinking honey to justify those verses. Honey does not leave a bad smell. It is also inconceivable that a trivial incident like drinking honey could cause such uproar in the household of the prophet to the extent that he decides to divorce all of his wives or to punish them for one month by not sleeping with them. Could such an insignificant incident like drinking honey provoke so much hue and cry that the creator of this universe had to intervene with a warning to Muhammad's wives that Muhammad would divorce all of them and He (Allah) would give him virgins and faithful wives? This explanation is absurd unless honey is the code word for something else that the prophet found between the legs of Mariyah.

The low moral standards and lack of ethical values of the defendant can be revealed by his examples and stories of his life. Like this one:

Bukhari Volume 7, Book 63, number 182: *“Narrated Abu Usaid: We went out with the Prophet to a garden called Ash-Shaut till we reached two walls between which we sat down. The Prophet said, "Sit here," and went in (the garden). The Jauniyya (a lady from Bani Jaun) had been brought and lodged in a house in a date-palm garden in the home of Umaina bint An-Numan bin Sharahil, and her wet nurse was with her. **When the Prophet entered upon her, he said to her, "Give me yourself as a gift."** She said, **"Can a princess give herself to an ordinary man?"** The Prophet raised his hand to pat her so that she might become tranquil. She said, "I seek refuge with Allah from you." He said, "You have sought refuge with One Who gives refuge. Then the Prophet came out to us and said, "O Abu Usaid! Give her two white linen dresses to wear and let her go back to her family”.*

Didn't Muhammad have enough women already? Did he have to mount every beautiful woman whom he met? Pay attention to his temper. In one moment he is overtaken by lust asking his hostess to "give herself to him as a gift". When he is rejected he becomes violent and raises his hand to beat her. Then when she seeks refuge with Allah the self-acclaimed prophet comes to his senses and feels guilty for his despicable behavior. And to alleviate his conscience decides to compensate his victim by bribing her. Is this the profile of a mentally stable man?

I am not accusing Muhammad of liking women. I accuse him of lusting after married women. I accuse the defendant of being a lecherous man who was ready to sacrifice anything to satisfy his quirks.

In the story of Aisha and the case of pedophilia I said that Arabs were a primitive lot with little rules to abide. Yet they had some code of ethics that they honored scrupulously. The Arabs prior to Islam had the noble costume of adopting orphans and raising them as their own.

Maududi, the commentator of the Quran writes: *“Whoever was adopted by the Arabs as a son was regarded as one of their own offspring: he got share in inheritance; he was treated like a real son and real brother by the adopted mother and the adopted sister; he could not marry the daughter of his adopted father and his widow after his death. And the same was the case if the adopted son died or divorced a wife. The adopted father regarded the woman as his real daughter-in-law.”*

Muhammad did away with this noble tradition to justify his marriage with his daughter in law Zainab who was married to his adopted son Zaid. .

This scandalous story of Muhammad’s lust and immorality is reported in ‘Kitab al Tabaqat’.

Muhammad Ibn Yahya Ibn Hayyan narrated, "The Messenger of God came to Zaid's house seeking him. [Zaid was then called Zaid Ibn Muhammad]. Perhaps the Messenger of God missed him at that time; that is why he said, 'Where is Zaid?' He went to his house seeking him and, when he did not find him, Zainab Bint Jahsh stood up to [meet] him in a light housedress, but the Messenger of God turned away from her. She said, 'He is not here, Messenger of God, so please come in; my father and mother are your ransom.' The Messenger of God refused to come in. Zainab had hurried to dress herself when she heard that the Messenger of God was at her door, so she leapt in a hurry, and the Messenger of God was deeply moved by her when she did that. He went away muttering something that was hardly understandable but for this sentence: *'Praise be to God who disposes the hearts.'* When Zaid came back home, she told him that the Messenger of God came. Zaid asked, 'You asked him to come in, didn't you?' She replied, 'I bade him to, but he refused.' He said, 'Have you heard [him say] anything?' She answered, 'When he had turned away, I heard him say something that I

could hardly understand. I heard him say, "Praise be to God who directs the hearts." 'Zaid went out to the Messenger of God and said, 'O Messenger of God, I learned that you came to my house. Did you come in? O Messenger of God, my father and mother are your ransom. Perhaps you liked Zainab. I can leave her.' The Messenger of God said, 'Hold on to your wife.' Zaid said, 'O Messenger of God, I will leave her.' The Messenger of God said, 'Keep your wife.' So when Zaid left her, she isolated herself and finished her legal period. While the Messenger of God was sitting talking with `Aisha, **he was taken in a trance**, and when it was lifted, he smiled and said, 'Who will go to Zainab to tell her the good news that **God wedded her to me from heaven?**' The Messenger of God recited, 'Thus you told someone whom God had favoured and whom you yourself have favoured: "Hold on to your wife."' (Tabaqat, 8:101-102).

Muhammad already had four other wives: Sawda, Aisha, Hafsa and Umma Salama. He was becoming powerful and by now confident that his brainwashed followers would accept any indecency from him and thus he felt no need for self-control. Despite that, many Arabs including his followers were shocked and found his conduct questionable.

Maududi explains: *"As soon as the marriage was contracted, there arose a storm of propaganda against the Holy Prophet. ...Therefore, they seized the question of this marriage as a godsend for themselves and thought they would put an end to his **moral superiority**, which was the real secret of his power and success. Therefore, stories were concocted that Muhammad, God forbid, had fallen in love with his daughter-in-law, and when the son had come to know of this, he divorced his wife, and the father married his daughter-in-law."*

As the Jury can see, Muhammad lusted after his own daughter-in-law when he laid eyes on her scantily dressed body.

He pretended receiving a revelation from his handy Allah that He married her to him in the heaven, so he entered upon her and possessed her with no further ado. The following narrative shows that the motive was nothing but lust.

Aisha said, *"I heard a great deal about her beauty and, moreover, about how God wedded her from heaven, and I said, 'For sure she will boast over this with us.'" (Tabaqat, 8:101-102).*

It was in this occasion that the verse known as curtain was "revealed". `

Sulaiman Ibn Harb narrated, quoting Hammad Ibn Zaid, quoting Ayyub Ibn Abi Qulaba that Anas said, "I know about this verse, 'the verse of the curtain', more than anyone else. When Zainab was given to the Messenger of God, he held a banquet on the night he married Zainab, invited the people and served them a meal. He wished that they leave afterward, because his mind was set on his bride. He stood up to let them know he wanted to leave, so some left. He stood up once more, but some stayed. He stood up a third time, and then they all left. So he entered his house [where the bride was] and Anas followed him, but he prevented him [from coming in] by letting down the curtain and said,

"O ye who believe! Enter not the Prophet's houses,- until leave is given you,- for a meal, (and then) not (so early as) to wait for its preparation: but when ye are invited, enter; and when ye have taken your meal, disperse, without seeking familiar talk. Such (behaviour) annoys the Prophet: he is ashamed to dismiss you, but Allah is not ashamed (to tell you) the truth. And when ye ask (his ladies) for anything ye want, ask them from before a screen: that makes for greater purity for your hearts and for theirs. Nor is it right for you that ye should annoy Allah's Messenger, or that ye should marry his widows after him at any time. Truly such a thing is in Allah's sight an enormity". 33.53

The people arose and he let the curtain down. *al-Simt al-thamin*, p.110; *al-Isti`ab*, 40:1851; *al-Isaba*, 9:83.

The above is one example of how the defendant manipulated his gullible followers and bent the rules of decency as he went on. He lusted after a married woman who was none other than his own daughter in law. He claimed that his god married her to him in heaven so he could enter upon her with no waste of time. But the greatest harm he caused is to annul the most beautiful tradition of the Arabs, which was the tradition of adopting the orphan children. Here I quote the opinion of some of the Islamic scholars in defense of what their prophet did and leave the judgment to the Jury.

Maududi writes:

“This custom clashed in every detail with the laws of marriage and divorce and inheritance enjoined by Allah in Surahs Al-Baqarah and An-Nisa. It made a person who could get no share in inheritance entitled to it at the expense of those who were really entitled to it. It prohibited marriage between the men and the women who could contract marriage perfectly lawfully. And, above all, it helped spread the immoralities which the Islamic Law wanted to eradicate. For a real mother and a real sister and a real daughter cannot be like the adopted mother and the adopted sister and the adopted daughter, however one may try to sanctify the adopted relations as a custom. When the artificial relations endowed with customary sanctity are allowed to mix freely like the real relations, it cannot but produce evil results”.

This concept, however, could not be rooted out by merely passing a legal order, saying, the adopted son is not the real son. The centuries old **prejudices and superstitions** cannot be changed by mere word of mouth. Even if the people had accepted the command that these relations were not the real relations, they

would still have looked upon marriage between the adopted mother and the adopted son, the adopted brother and the sister, the adopted father and the daughter, and the adopted father-in-law and the daughter-in-law odious and detestable. Moreover, there would still exist some freedom of mixing together freely. Therefore, it was inevitable that the custom should be eradicated practically, and through the Holy Prophet himself. For no Muslim could ever conceive that a thing done by the Holy Prophet himself, and done by him under Allah's Command, could be detestable. Therefore, a little before the Battle of the Trench, the Holy Prophet was inspired by Allah that he should marry the divorced wife of his adopted son, Zaid bin Haritha (may Allah be pleased with him), and he acted on this Command during the siege of the Bani Quraiza. (The delay probably was caused for the reason that the prescribed waiting period had not yet ended, and in the meantime the Holy Prophet had to become busy in the preparation for war)."

Heikal in his book '*The Life of Muhammad*' writes:

"The All-Wise Legislator willed to undo the Arab practice of adopting children and passing onto them the adopter's genealogy and name, his investment of them with all the rights of the legitimate son including that of inheritance and the prohibition of marriage on grounds of consanguinity. The divine Legislator willed to give the adopted son only the right of a client and co-religionist. In this sense, the verse was revealed that: *"God did not make your adopted son a. your own sons. To declare them so is your empty claim. God's word is righteous and constitutes the true guidance."* [Qur'an, 33:4] It follows from this revelation that the adopter may marry the ex-wife of his adopted son and vice versa. But how is such provision to be implemented? Who, among the Arabs, could implement this legislation and thereby openly repudiate the ancient traditions? Even Muhammad himself, despite his tremendous will-power and profound

understanding of the wisdom implicit in the divine command, found himself disinclined to implement this judgment by marrying Zaynab after Zayd had divorced her. Indeed, the criticisms of the commonplace and the vituperations with which he was indicted in the public eye for breaking down such well established custom did, for a time, influence Muhammad's judgment and affected his decision. It was at this stage that the following divine criticism was addressed to Muhammad: *"Would you hide, O Muhammad, within yourself that which God was going to bring to light anyway? Would you fear the gossip of the people? Isn't God more worthy of being feared?"* [Qur'an, 33:37] The truth is, however, that Muhammad was the exemplar of obedience to God; his life was the implementation of that which he was entrusted to convey to mankind. The outcome, therefore, was that Muhammad would not give any weight at all to the gossip of the people if he were to marry the ex-wife of his adopted son, since the fear of social condemnation is nothing comparable to that of condemnation by God, of disobedience to divine commandment. Thus, Muhammad married Zaynab in order to provide a good example of what the All-Wise Legislator was seeking to establish by way of rights and privileges for adoption. In this regard, God said: *"After a term of married life with her husband, We permitted you to marry her so that it may hence be legitimate and morally blameless for a believer to marry the wife of his adopted son provided that wife has already been divorced. That is God's commandment which must be fulfilled."* [Qur'an, 33:37]

The above is the typical expose of how the mind of a Muslim works. Indeed there is no narcotic more potent than religion. The fact that Muhammad annulled the most sublime human tradition does not make wonder this great scholar of Islam. He never questions what is so wrong with adopting an orphaned child and raising him like your own? Why would Allah dislike such a

wonderful thing that virtually saves the life of the orphan, provides a loving home for him and allows a couple who may not be able to have children of their own have a child through adoption? Why would God want to abolish this lofty practice?

Instead of asking these logical question that might lead to questioning the claim of Muhammad, the apologists of Islam accept a priory that Muhammad was a messenger of God and whatever he did was the right thing, even if it is abhorrent and disgusting to our senses.

These very apologists would denounce any other person committing these acts of immorality, yet they accept happily any evil act perpetrated by Muhammad. Heikal, under the heading of '*Great Men and the Law*' continues:

"It is possible to refute all these claims with one argument. If supposed to be true, they constitute no flaw in the prophethood of Muhammad, in his own greatness or that of his message. The rules which are law to the people at large do not apply to the great".

Heikal goes on to explain that Moses also was a murderer yet this did not stop his prophethood and that Jesus' entire life is a flagrant violation of the cosmic law because he was born through immaculate conception and therefore one should not blame Muhammad for violating the human laws of decency and morality. Heikal adds: "*Muhammad's violation was not one of a cosmic law, but one of a social law, which is permissible to every great man.*"

According to the logic of this great Islamic scholar, not only Hitler but all the criminals are great men as they also violate the moral and the social laws just as the great Prophet of Islam did. To Muslims, Muhammad was superlative in everything including his lusts for women, his cold-blooded murder of innocent civilians, his assassinations or his looting and

plundering. To a Muslim, the evil acts perpetrated by Muhammad are not proof that Muhammad was a liar, but proof that those evil acts are divine.

The prosecution accuses Muhammad of sacrificing the lives and happiness of millions of orphans and depriving them of a loving home to justify his lust for his own daughter in law, to cover up his own immorality and save face in front of his followers. This indeed is one of the most evil acts of the defendant. This man had no conscience and could care less of the harm that he would cause to the society. Millions of orphans who could be adopted and be raised in loving families were deprived of this bounty, being not mahram (lawful) to their would-be mothers and sisters, they could not be admitted in any household and were left in the streets to fend for their own survival. Millions of them perished and millions grew up as beggars and ended up in poverty. I demand justice for these wasted and perished lives.

The prosecutor presents the verse 33.53 quoted above as an exhibit of how the defendant used Allah for his own lustfulness, caprices and selfish desires.

How foolish one must be to believe that the maker of this vast universe be so concerned about his prophet that reveal verses telling the believers, do not enter the Prophet's house without invitation, leave after you eat your meal, do not seek familiar talk with him lest you annoy him and I the maker of this universe tell you this because my prophet is shy?

It is obvious that Muhammad, after four years of struggling with poverty in Medina, in this fifth year, had won few wars, had looted a few caravans and had taken possession of the wealth of the Jews whom he had banished and now he wanted respect from his follower. He wanted to send the message that they should not just treat him like one of their own as they used to when he was a

nobody and depended on them to feed him. He wanted them to know that he is somebody. He has the wealth, can marry as many women as he wishes (in fact in that very year he married three additional wives) and now he can afford giving banquets. So they must from now on respect him. But of course it would not look very modest to ask that directly. And modesty was the image that this narcissist man wanted to project of himself. So he put words in the mouth of his handy and ever-ready-to-appease god, and makes his wishes "revealed" as divine decrees.

Muhammad knew that if he told his beguiled followers, you must respect me from now on; they could have known that he is after power and self-aggrandizement. How come he was just another companion all these years and now that he is rich, he is demanding respect? So he lets Allah to speak on his behalf and do his bidding. Certainly no man would be able to argue with that. If he lusted for a woman, he would make his god reveal a verse, if he wanted respect, his god was there to comply with his wishes, if he had quarrels with his wives, his god could put them all in their place and make them obedient.

This man took everyone for a ride. He invented a cult to fool people. Muhammad was not just a liar but a monster. It is hard to find a man as evil as him in the annals of history. I urge the jury to find the defendant guilty of lewdness, of indecency, of immorality and of deceit. I urge my Muslim brothers and sisters to open their eyes. Muhammad was not a messenger of God. He lied. The proof is overwhelming. It is foolish to believe that great men need not obey the laws. Great men are the first to obey the laws of morality, ethics and the Golden Rule. Muhammad broke every law of the Golden Rule. God can't be so sadist as to send to us a man with such a low moral fiber, who would break all the moral laws, as a messenger. Muhammad did not set a good example. He was not honorable. He did not have sublime morals.

I urge you to condemn Muhammad, take your life in your own hand and salvage your soul.

If God and Devil are real, Allah is Devil and Muhammad is his messenger. God can't be this evil. Save your soul, my friend, and spread this message to save the world before this Devil blows it up.

Part VIII

Misogyny

Dec. 7, 2003

Ali Sina: Prosecutor

In this session, the charge that the prosecution is bringing against the defendant is the charge of misogyny. The prosecutor states that the defendant abased women and that womankind prior to him in Arabia and in virtually every other country that later fell under the domination of Islam, enjoyed more liberties and rights than in the society that he created. The charge is not that the defendant Mr. Muhammad bin Abdallah did not give enough rights to women but that he took away their already earned rights and relegated them to second class citizens, dependant on men and at their service. He imposed gender slavery on women and lowered their status to that of chattels and animals. In no society and in no moment of history, women were as much vilified and belittled as they are in Islam. Islam is a misogynist religion par excellence.

Status of Arab Women before Islam

Unfortunately Muslims left no trace of the pre Islamic literature of Arabia. They dismissed that era as Jahelia (age of ignorance), burned every book and destroyed every trace of its

history. Therefore it is not easy to unravel the truth and know the exact status of women prior to Islam in that land. We have only the Islamic sources to rely on. Even from these sources we can have a faint glimpse of that era and witness the fact that women had more rights before Islam than after it.

Let us start with Khadijah the first wife of Muhammad. This woman was a widow; she was wealthy and ran her own successful business. She employed men to work for her including Muhammad. This shows that women could own and manage businesses. And men of the Quraysh did not think it is degrading to have a woman as boss. As the hadith reports, it was Khadijah who proposed to Muhammad. This is yet another indication of the level of freedom reached by women in the pre-Islamic Arabia. In Islamic societies, even today, such a thing would be taboo.

One more example that shows women had more rights and respect in pre Islamic society of Arabia is Hind the wife of Abu Sufyan a cousin and an archenemy of Muhammad. It is reported that in the Battle of Uhud. Hind was leading the women of the Quraysh who valiantly were encouraging their men to fight back and stop the aggression of the Muslims.

As the fighting increased, the Quraysh women, led by Hind, began to beat their drums to urge their men on. One of the fighters of Muhammad, Abu Dujanaj said, *"I saw someone urging the enemy on, shouting wildly, and I made for him, but when I lifted my sword against him he screamed and I saw that it was a woman; I respected the Messenger's sword too much to use it on a woman."* That woman was Hind.^[1]

Another example of women commanding men in battles is Aisha the child-wife of Muhammad who after his death led an army of Muslim men against Ali in the war known as Jamal (Camel).

There is also the example of Asma bt. Marwan, the Jewess poetess of Medina who at the behest of the defendant was assassinated for composing inflammatory poetries against him. The fact that the defendant feared Asma to the extent that he thought she is endangering his career by merely writing poetries and therefore assassinated her is yet another proof that in the pre Islamic culture of Arabia, the Arabs respected their women, listened to them and let themselves to be influenced by them. Women were not dismissed as imbeciles or deficient in intelligence as later they came to be known, but rather were leaders of thoughts and notable members of the society.

The most glaring example of women's lofty status before Islam is the fact that during the time of Muhammad a woman claimed to be a prophetess and gained many following. Today a Muslim woman cannot be even a cleric or an Imam. Amazingly Muslim women today are the first apologists of their low status and fully accept the denigration with which Islam has enshrouded them.

As exhibit (A) the prosecutor is presenting a hadith where it shows that the close companion of Muhammad Umar b. Khattab, who eventually became the 2nd Khalif, complains that the Muslim women are learning "the bad habits" of emancipation and independence from the women of Medina and that the Prophet should do something about it. This story took place when Muhammad had his fling with the Coptic girl Mariyah who was a maid of his wife Hafsa, had a fight with his wives because they complained and threatened to divorce them. He was sitting at home pouting when Umar paid him a visit. Umar later narrated:

"We, the people of Quraish, used to have authority over women, but when we came to live with the Ansar, [Muslims of Medina] we noticed that the Ansari women had the upper hand

*over their men, so our women started acquiring the habits of the Ansari women. **Once I shouted at my wife and she paid me back in my coin and I disliked that she should answer me back.** She said, 'Why do you take it ill that I retort upon you? By Allah, the wives of the Prophet retort upon him, and some of them may not speak with him for the whole day till night.' What she said scared me and I said to her, 'Whoever amongst them does so, will be a great loser.' Then I dressed myself and went to Hafsa and asked her, 'Does any of you keep Allah's Apostle angry all the daylong till night?' She replied in the affirmative. I said, 'She is a ruined losing person (and will never have success)! Doesn't she fear that Allah may get angry for the anger of Allah's Apostle and thus she will be ruined? Don't ask Allah's Apostle too many things, and don't retort upon him in any case, and don't desert him. Demand from me whatever you like, and don't be tempted to imitate your neighbor (i.e. 'Aisha) in her behavior towards the Prophet), for she (i.e. Aisha) is more beautiful than you, and more beloved to Allah's Apostle....'*

*"So, I entered upon the Prophet and saw him lying on a mat without wedding on it, and the mat had left its mark on the body of the Prophet, and he was leaning on a leather pillow stuffed with palm fires. I greeted him and while still standing, I said, 'have you divorced your wives?' He raised his eyes to me and replied in the negative. And then while still standing, I said chatting: 'Will you heed what I say, 'O Allah's Apostle! **We, the people of Quraish used to have the upper hand over our women (wives), and when we came to the people whose women had the upper hand over them...**'"*

*'Umar told the whole story (about his wife). **"On that the Prophet smiled."** 'Umar further said, "I then said, 'I went to Hafsa and said to her: Do not be tempted to imitate your companion ('Aisha) for she is more beautiful than you and more beloved to the Prophet.' **The Prophet smiled again.**'"*^[2]

The above Hadith is self-explanatory. The Meccans were more bigoted than the rest of the Arabs. Often people living in religious hubs are more extremists and more misogynists than the people living in cities that are less religious. However, people do not think uniformly. In any society some are more fanatical than others. As it appears Umar and Muhammad were particularly more close-minded than the rest of the Meccans. In other words these two men were the bigots of the bigots. While the rest of the Meccans did not have any problem listening to the pep talks of their women or accepting women to run their own businesses, these two men thought emancipation of women is gross, an indecency that must be corrected.

Hijab Was Suggested by Umar and Accepted by Allah

Muhammad, fearing younger men casting eyes on his young and beautiful wives and “molesting” them, ordered them to veil themselves. Of course he made his wish to come as a revelation:

33.59: “O Prophet! Tell thy wives and daughters, and the believing women, that they should cast their outer garments over their persons (when abroad): that is most convenient, that they should be known (as such) and not molested.”

Umar explained how the above verse was “revealed upon his insistence.

“My Lord agreed with me (Umar) in three things... (2) And as regards the veiling of women, I said 'O Allah's Apostle! I wish you ordered your wives to cover themselves from the men because good and bad ones talk to them.' So the verse of the veiling of the women was revealed.”^[3]

It seems odd that the maker of this universe should need the advice of one of his creatures to ordain laws for mankind. Umar foolishly boasts that God agreed with him. However, not all the companions of Muhammad were as foolhardy as Umar. **Abdullah ibn Sarh**, who was a scribe of Muhammad, was

cleverer. He left Muhammad and Islam after he noticed that God changed his revelations and agreed with him after he suggested better verses. That is of course another subject. What interests us at this moment is the fact that women prior to Islam did not wear this veil of shame that they are forced to wear today. It was because of Muhammad's own insecurities, who as an old man, hoarding a harem of young and beautiful women, was fearful of younger and more virile men casting eyes on his wives that the order of veiling was issued.

The fears of this old man of his wives lusting after younger men are reflected in these verses that are conveniently placed in the mouth of Allah.

Q.33:30 O Consorts of the Prophet! If any of you were guilty of evident unseemly conduct, the Punishment would be doubled to her, and that is easy for Allah.

31. But any of you that is devout in the service of Allah and His Messenger, and works righteousness,- to her shall We grant her reward twice: and We have prepared for her a generous Sustenance. ^[4]

Muhammad often reminded his wives to behave in a way as not to attract the attention of other men and cover themselves as not to make themselves desired by strangers.

32. O Consorts of the Prophet! Ye are not like any of the (other) women: if ye do fear (Allah), be not too complacent of speech, lest one in whose heart is a disease should be moved with desire: but speak ye a speech (that is) just.

*33. And stay quietly in your houses, and make not a dazzling display, like that of the former Times of Ignorance; and establish regular Prayer, and give regular Charity; and obey Allah and **His Messenger**. And Allah only wishes to remove all abomination from you, ye members of the Family, and to make you pure and spotless.* ^[5]

Here we can see clearly, that women prior to Islam, or in the “Times of Ignorance”, as the defendant disparagingly referred to it, could go out of their houses unveiled in “dazzling display”. Today a woman, displaying some hair or an arm inside her family car could be dragged out and beaten by Islamic moral police in some Islamic countries like Iran and Saudi Arabia as they did in Taliban's Afghanistan. There are few Islamic countries where women are allowed to go out of their houses unveiled, let alone in “dazzling display”

Men Are Maintainers of Women and Superior to Them.

The defendant, not only took away the women's freedom of dress, he made them subservient to men and dependant on them. He wrote: “*Men are the maintainers of women because Allah has made some of them to excel others and because they spend out of their property; the good women are therefore obedient, guarding the unseen as Allah has guarded.*” [6]

The above verse reduces woman into the livestock of man giving him the authority to maintain her as if she were his donkey or camel. Sadly, Khadija did not live long enough to remind her beloved husband that when he married her, she was the maintainer of him who spent out of her property.

In another place he expressly states that men have a degree of advantage over women.

“*And women shall have rights similar to the rights against them, according to what is equitable; but men have a degree (of advantage) over them.*” [7]

The defendant did everything he could to make women subservient to their husbands. According to him women who do not obey their husbands would go to hell.

The Prophet said, “I also saw the Hell-fire and I had never seen such a horrible sight. I saw that most of the inhabitants were

women." The people asked, "O Allah's Apostle! Why is it so?" The Prophet replied, "Because of their ungratefulness." It was asked whether they are ungrateful to Allah. The Prophet said, "They are ungrateful to their companions of life (husbands) and ungrateful to good deeds. If you are benevolent to one of them throughout the life and if she sees anything (undesirable) in you, she will say, 'I have never had any good from you.'" [8]

Men Can Beat Their Wives

He also instructed men to beat their wives if they are not obedient.

“and (as to) those on whose part you **fear** desertion, admonish them, and leave them alone in the sleeping-places ***and beat them;*** then if they obey you, do not seek a way against them; surely Allah is High, Great.” [9]

Mishkat al-Masabih narrates: "the above verse was revealed in connection with a woman who complained to Mohammad that her husband slapped her on the face (which was still marked by the slap). At first the Prophet said to her: 'Get even with him', but then added: 'Wait until I think about it.' Later on the above verse was revealed, after which the Prophet said: 'We wanted one thing but Allah wanted another, and what Allah wanted is best.'" [10]

Maybe on the spur of the moment and faced with this obvious injustice, Muhammad was moved by a fleeting rash of compassion, but that did not last very long. Soon he thought about the implications of what he had said and how this would affect his own relationship with his rebellious wives. So he made his Allah issue that shamefully unjust verse giving men the liberty to beat their wives to make them obedient.

As it is clear from the above verse, a woman does not have to disobey her husband in order to be beat. He husband can beat her only if he fears that she may disobey her. As Irshad Manji in *'The trouble with Islam'* writes (p.34 regarding 4:34) "*To*

deserve a beating, a woman doesn't have to disobey anybody, a man merely has to fear her disobedience. His insecurity becomes her problem"

Good women do not complain if their husbands beat them:

Book 11, Number 2141:

Narrated Abdullah ibn Abu Dhubab: Iyas ibn Abdullah ibn Abu Dhubab reported the Apostle of Allah (peace be upon him) as saying: Do not beat Allah's handmaidens, but when Umar came to the Apostle of Allah (peace be upon him) and said: Women have become emboldened towards their husbands, he (the Prophet) gave permission to beat them. Then many women came round the family of the Apostle of Allah (peace be upon him) complaining against their husbands. So the Apostle of Allah (peace be upon him) said: Many women have gone round Muhammad's family complaining against their husbands. They are not the best among you.

The husband does not have to explain to anyone why he beats his wife.

Book 11, Number 2142:

Narrated Umar ibn al-Khattab: "The Prophet (peace be upon him) said: A man will not be asked as to why he beat his wife".

He went even as far as to say women should prostrate in front of their husbands:

"If I were to command anyone to make prostration before another I would command women to prostrate themselves before their husbands, because of the special right over them given to husbands by Allah." ^[11]

In a hadith Aisha narrated one night Muhammad, left her home after he thought she is asleep. She secretly followed her and when he came back and saw she was panting, she inquired and made her confess by telling her if she concealed what she

was doing the “Subtle and the Aware” [ghosts] would inform him. Aisha says that when I confessed that I had followed him, **“He struck me on the chest which caused me pain,”** [Muslim 4.2127]

Women’s Deficiencies

A hadith reports one defendant’s meeting with women where he called them “deficient in intelligence and religion”:

“Once Allah's Apostle went out to the Musalla (to offer the prayer) o 'Id-al-Adha or Al-Fitr prayer. Then he passed by the women and said, "O women! **Give alms**, [this money would go to him as the viceroy of God on Earth and he would distribute it to those whose favor he was seeking or to make the show of generosity] as I have seen that the majority of the dwellers of Hell-fire were you (women)." They asked, "Why is it so, O Allah's Apostle?" He replied, *"You curse frequently and are ungrateful to your husbands. I have not seen anyone more deficient in intelligence and religion than you. A cautious sensible man could be led astray by some of you."* The women asked, "O Allah's Apostle! What is deficient in our intelligence and religion?" He said, "Is not the evidence of two women equal to the witness of one man?" They replied in the affirmative. He said, "This is the deficiency in her intelligence. Isn't it true that a woman can neither pray nor fast during her menses?" The women replied in the affirmative. He said, "This is the deficiency in her religion." [12]

The above is a flagrant case of misogyny where the defendant commits the travesty of first taking the rights of the women away and then condemning them for not having those rights. Not only he injures, but he adds salt to the injury by blaming the victim. This hadith is reported by various narrators and is also recorded by Sahih Muslim, which makes it one of the most authoritative hadiths of Muhammad.

Women Are Created FOR Men

In another verse the defendant says:

"And of His signs is that He created for you, of yourselves, spouses, that you may repose in them" ^[13]

The Arabic text makes it clear that "for you" is masculine meaning the verse is addressing men and "them" is in feminine gender. (In fact Allah in the Quran never addresses women directly. He always speaks to the Prophet or the male believers. Women are always referred to in third person.) What this verse is conveying is that women are created FOR men and are for their enjoyment.

Razi in At-Tafsir al-Kabir, commenting on Q. 30:21 wrote: "His saying 'created for you' is a proof that *women were created like animals and plants* and other useful things, just as the Most High has said 'He created for you what is on earth' and that necessitates the woman not to be created for worship and carrying the Divine commands. We say creating the women is one of the graces bestowed upon us and charging them with Divine commands to complete the graces bestowed upon us, not that they are charged as we men are charged. For women are not charged with many commands as we are charged, because the woman is weak, silly, in one sense she is like a child, and no commands are laid upon a child, but for the grace of Allah upon us to be complete, women had to be charged so that they may fear the torment of punishment and so follow her husband, and keep away from what is forbidden, otherwise corruption would be rampant."

Hadi Sabzevari, an eminent Muslim scholar, in his commentary on another grand Muslim thinker, Sadr al-Mote'alin, wrote:

That Sadr ad-Deen Shirazi classifies women as animals is a delicate allusion to the fact that women, due to the deficiency in

their intelligence and understanding of intricacies, and due to their fondness of the adornments of the world, are truly and justly among the mute animals [al-haywanti al-samita]. They have the nature of beasts [ad-dawwab], but they have been given the disguise of human beings so that men would not be loath to talk to them and be compelled to have sexual intercourse with them. That is why our immaculate Law [shar'ina al-mutahhar] takes men's side and gives them superiority in most matters, including divorce, "nushuz," etc. ^[14]

These scholars did not make up these derogatory remarks about women on their own. They were interpreting the sayings of Muhammad whom to them was the best messenger of God and an example to follow. The reference to the inferiority of woman and their deficiency in intelligence and religion is abounding in the Hadith and the Quran.

In fact "naqisatan 'aqlan wa dinan" (deficient in intelligence and religion), an aphorism used among the Arabs, is an allusion to women and stems from the sayings of Muhammad.

Women Who Refuse Sex Will Be Cursed by Angels

The following Hadith also makes it clear that women are created for men and for their satisfaction.

“Allah's Apostle said, "If a husband calls his wife to his bed (i.e. to have sexual relation) and she refuses and causes him to sleep in anger, *the angels will curse her till morning.*" ^[15]

The above makes one wonder, whether Allah has nothing else to do than worrying about the sexual pleasures of Muslim men? It seems absurd that God would employ so many angels to do nothing but sit around and curse the women who do not want to please their husbands sexually. ‘Cursing’ means ‘invoking the wrath of God’. Why would God need so many angles to ask him this when he can punish the women who refuse having sex with their husbands on his own. If he wants to punish them, why ask

angels to beg for it? There seems to be a lot of redundancies and mismanagements in the Divine House of Allah. It is like the president of a country, have his staff lobby him for the plans that he wants to put into action. It just makes no sense. If these angels are paid then this is a complete waste of divine funds and if they are not paid then it is slavery. You can't say the angels do this voluntarily because the angles do nothing without the will of Allah. There are more hadiths on this subject:

“Abu Huraira (Allah be pleased with him) reported Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) as saying: By Him in Whose Hand is my life, when a man calls his wife to his bed, and she does not respond, the One Who is in the heaven is displeased with her until he (her husband) is pleased with her.” ^[16]

And “The Prophet said, "If a woman spends the night deserting her husband's bed (does not sleep with him), then the angels send their curses on her till she comes back (to her husband)." ^[17]

It is hard to determine why the defendant was so concerned about this issue. Perhaps it helps to remember that he was an old man when his numerous wives were mostly teenagers or in their early twenties. Perhaps his teeth were decaying and his mouth had a foul smell. Perhaps his wives were not that much desirous to share the bed with an old, smelly and impotent man like him. Is it possible that Muhammad concocted these stories to intimidate his young wives not to reject his sexual advances, when he wanted to “fondle” them? Or you really think Allah is also a pimp?

According to this self-serving messenger, a man's sexual urges are such an emergency that a woman must leave her food to burn in oven than leaving her husband burn in heat for her.

"The prophet of Allah said: When a man calls his wife to satisfy his desire, let her come to him though she is occupied at the oven." ^[18]

Women are Pudenda?!!

As if all these derogatory remarks about women were not enough, Muhammad even compared them to pudenda.

"Ali reported the Prophet saying: 'Women have ten ('awrat). When she gets married, the husband covers one, and when she dies the grave covers the ten.'" ^[19]

What is awrah? The *Encyclopedia of Islam* defines 'awrah as pudendum, that is *the external genitals, especially of the female*. [Latin *pudendum* (literally) a thing to be ashamed of]" ^[20]

And according to the following Hadith, women not only have ten 'awrat, but the woman herself is perceived as 'awrah:

"The woman is 'awrah. When she goes outside (the house), the devil welcomes her." ^[21]

As the following Hadith indicates, women are discouraged from going outside the house, even to pray in the mosque.

"A woman is closest to God's face, if she is found in the core of her house. And the prayer of the woman in the house is better than her prayer in the mosque." ^[22]

This is a far cry from the time when Arabs respected women as businesswomen (Khadija), obeyed them as army generals (Aisha), listened to them as leaders of thoughts (Asma bt. Marwan), received encouragements from them (Hind) and followed them as prophetesses. Gradually, as the new generations were indoctrinated by the teachings of Muhammad they became scornful of women and eventually Muslim women lost their rights along with their dignity.

Women Have Less Legal Rights

The "deficiency of women" in intelligence affects their legal rights as well.

Qur'an, 2:282 "And call in to witness two witnesses, men; or if the two be not men, then one man and two women, such

witness as you approve of, that if one woman errs the other will remind her."

In other words not only a woman alone cannot witness against a criminal, if there is no male witness the testimonies of any number of women without the testimony of a man are worthless. This means that if a woman is raped and she cannot produce any male witnesses, (which is logically almost always the case) she cannot witness against her assailant. However, her testimony can be regarded as confession of fornication and can be used against her. Also if the victim of rape becomes pregnant, that is evidence of the adultery and she could be charged and punished with death by stoning. The jury can recall the famous case of Amina Lawal who was sentenced by the Islamic courts of Nigeria to be stoned as soon as her infant was weaned. The father of the child could not be charged with adultery because her testimony was not enough. This case came to the attention of the public, but thousands of such cases have happened and continue to happen without ever anyone hearing of them.

Women Inherit Less

Muslim apologists claim that prior to Islam women had no rights at all and received no inheritance. This is obviously not so. Khadija received her wealth through inheritance. When Muhammad decided that women should receive half of the inheritance of what their blood brothers receive, women did not celebrate with joy.

4.11: "Allah (thus) directs you as regards your Children's (Inheritance): to the male, a portion equal to that of two females".

As a matter of fact many, including one of his own wives complained that this arrangement is unfair to women.

Umme Salmah (RA) said: "O Messenger of Allah! The men wage Jihad [can collect booty] whereas we (women) do not, and

we receive half the inheritance" (i.e. blood-brothers receive double the share of blood sisters). Thereafter the verse '*And do not covet.... 4.32.*' was revealed." [23]

4.32 "And in no wise covet those things in which Allah Hath bestowed His gifts More freely on some of you than on others: To men is allotted what they earn, and to women what they earn."

This is an indication that women prior to Islam had more rights to their inheritance than what was allotted to them in Islam.

Muhammad's Opinion of Women

Muhammad had such a low regard for women that he compared them to tith or farmland and said you can enter your tith from **wherever** you like (ana she'tom).

2.223 "Your wives are as a tith unto you; so approach your tith when or how ye will..." (Often the translations are sanitized)

It is not proper to be more descriptive, but it is obvious that the word ana she'tom or wherever allows a man to enter a woman from every hole. The above led Muslims to regard women as nothing but toys created to appease men.

"Umar was once talking when his wife interjected, so he said to her: 'You are a toy, if you are needed we will call you.'" [24]

The most eminent Islamic scholar Ghazali said:

"In the company of women, looking at them, and playing with them, the soul is refreshed, the heart is rested, and the man is strengthened to the worship of God...this is why God said: 'That he might rest in her.' (Q. 7:189)" [25]

The verse that Ghazali refers to is:

Verse 7.189 "It is He Who created you from a single person, and made his mate of like nature, in order that he might dwell with her (rest in her)."

It is obvious that Muhammad did not have much reverence for women.

The Prophet said, *"After me I have not left any affliction more harmful to men than women."* [26]

In another place he compares the women to a crooked rib.

"Woman is like a rib. When you attempt to straighten it, you would break it. And if you leave her alone you would benefit by her, and crookedness will remain in her." [27]

This hadith is classified as "agreed upon" because it is reported by other collectors of hadith too.

In another hadith he said:

"The woman advances and retires in the shape of a devil, so when one of you sees a woman, he should come to his wife, for that will repel what he feels in his heart". [28]

Women on Top

Prior to Islam, in non-Arab countries, such as in Persia and Byzantine, women had more rights than in Arab countries. In fact in Iran women could become Queens and rulers of the country. What Muhammad thought of that?

'When the Prophet heard the news that the people of the Persia had made the daughter of Khusrau their Queen (ruler), he said, "Never will succeed such a nation as makes a woman their ruler"' [29]

Someone asked me why then in some Islamic countries like Bangladesh and Pakistan there were women prime ministers? The answer is that many Muslims do not know their religion and unwittingly follow the customs of their pre Islamic "jahelia" era. Jahelia means ignorance and Muslims often ignorantly do things that are not Islamic. The Taliban, on the other hand, know the real Islam. The more a country is Islamic and the more the Sharia takes over, the more women lose their rights and privileges.

Female Infanticide

One argument that Muslim apologists bring up as proof that Muhammad liberated women is the Quran's injunction of not burying the female infants alive. They want you to believe this odious act was the common practice of the Arabs that was stopped only after Islam. However, this myth can be dismissed with a simple logic. If this practice was so common, how come the Arabs could afford to have several wives and how did their race survive at all?

Female infanticide is practiced in China and in India even today. This is done only among the least educated and the poorest people. This practice, though, is illegal and a criminal act and the perpetrators will be prosecuted if caught. There is no reason to believe that it was different in Arabia. Certainly most Arabs disdained this act. It just goes against the human nature. When Muhammad prohibited it, he echoed the voice of the majority and said what was commonsense to everyone. It is like a self-styled prophet today prohibits drinking and driving. Would that be regarded as a groundbreaking law?

Muhammad did not fail to portray woman as evil, crooked, deficient in intelligence, created only for the enjoyment of man. Whose only function is to be the incubator for his sons! Who must serve him and be obedient to him! Who is not capable to be responsible for her own life but must be maintained by a man. Who should receive less inheritance and whose testimony is worth half of that of a man because she is deemed to be imbecile with faulty memory!

Women in Islam lost every right, including the right to travel alone. ^[30]

God and Daughters? Indeed a Division Most Unfair!

Muhammad had such a low esteem of women that he thought it is not befitting for God to have daughters when ordinary man can boast having sons.

In verse 53.19-22, after dismissing the claim that God has any daughters as the Quraysh used to think, he says appallingly:

“WHAT!... For you the male sex, and for Him, the female?

Behold, such would be indeed a division most unfair!”

Suppose God had only daughters and no sons: Would it really be an unfair division? Should God be embarrassed for not having sons? Ironically the fate played a joke on Muhammad whose sons all died at infancy and he was left with only daughters. One can only imagine how much embarrassment he must have felt for not having sons. A man with such sense of inferiority and such a colossal ego had nothing but daughters, which he thought was “a division most unfair”.

(Note that the verse refers to God in third person pronoun. This is not an error in translation. The Arabic word is *lahoo*, which means “for him”. Muhammad just forgot that the Quran is supposed to be the word of God and should be written in first person pronoun)

The fact that Arabs had female gods is proof that they respected women enough to attribute them the roles of deities. According to Muhammad, all denizens of the celestial assembly including the angles are male. The only female inhabitants of paradise are the houris who are the celestial whores created for the enjoyment of men. In fact, few women are allowed in Paradise. As Muhammad said, most of them end up in hell.

More Disparaging Remarks about Women

In one hadith Muhammad equates women to dog and ass and says:

“[A man’s] prayer would be cut off by (passing of an) ass, woman, and black Dog.” ^[31]

In another place he interpreted a dream that he had of a black woman to an “epidemic”. ^[32]

He also said women are the most harmful affliction to men:

"After me I have not left any affliction more harmful to men than women." ^[33]

A Good Wife

Man's only duty to his wife is to maintain her. He has to provide for her food, shelter and clothing, i.e. meet her physical needs. Her emotional, psychological and sexual needs should not be of his concern. As far as Islam is concerned those needs simply do not exist because women are not really human beings. Muhammad not only had a score of women in his harem when he was an old impotent man, he even prohibited his extremely young wives to remarry after his death. This man was so possessive that could not bear the thought of another man sleeping with his wives even after his death.

He sanctioned polygamy and allowed men to marry four wives (Q.4:3) *and as many slave girls as they please*. Some scholars believe that this verse does not limit the number of wives but rather the verse should be understood as a man can marry any number of wives, two, three, four, etc. ^[34]

Therefore men are allowed to lust after other women when they are married but:

"The virtuous wife, [is one who] if her husband bids her, she obeys him; if he looks at her, she pleases him; if he gives her an oath; she fulfils it, and if he is absent from her, she guards herself and his property." ^[35]

Isn't this how one would describe a good dog?

Now let us see what other virtues a good woman must have: *"The best women are those who have the prettiest faces and the cheapest dowry."* ^[36]

And here is one more quality of a good wife: *"The good wife is out of this world because she helps free you to concentrate on*

the life to come. She does that by doing her house duties (instead of the husband having to do them), and by satisfying the husband sexually so protecting him from sexual temptation." ^[37]

When a prophet is so contemptuous of women, so disdainful of their faith, so derisive of their intelligence, so abusive of their rights and so condescending of their status, can we expect more from his followers? Muslim women will never emancipate, as long as they look up at Muhammad as their spiritual guide. If they do not want to believe me, they must believe their own messenger who said:

"Allah's Apostle said, "Many amongst men reached (the level of) perfection but none amongst the women reached this level except Asia, Pharaoh's wife, and Mary, the daughter of Imran." ^[38]

Conclusion

Going into detail on this subject would require a book all on its own. The prosecution feels to have enough evidence presented for the Jury to convict the defendant of misogyny, abuse of women's rights and denigrating half of humanity. ^[39]

Because of this travesty (misogyny) Muslim women were abused and were not allowed to flourish to the full extent of their potentials. They became subject to humiliation, discrimination, rape, honor killing, and all sorts of physical, emotional and sexual abuses without being able to fight back for their rights. As the result the entire Muslim world languished and lagged behind because half of its population was barred from emancipation. They could not participate and contribute to the society

Women were denied education as it was deemed to be unnecessary. Uneducated women are ignorant and lack self esteem. These women raised sons and projected their own feeling of inferiority to their children. Those sons inherited the low self-esteem of their mothers and built the Islamic world with

inadequacy and incompetence fighting constantly with the demon inside, the demon of fear, hurt pride and humiliation. Eventually the whole Islamic world was plunged into darkness of ignorance, self-pity and dictatorship. Dr. Mahathir, the ex-Prime Minister of Malaysia, summed up this sentiment eloquently when in the 10th summit of the *Organization of Islamic Conference* he said: “*We are all Muslims. We are all oppressed. We are all being humiliated.*”

That is a well-expressed description of how Muslims feel. This sense of inferiority, however, is not because the Zionists have power over the Muslims by remote control, as Dr. Mahathir erroneously diagnosed, but the outcome of the abuse of women in all the Islamic countries.

Of course not every man with lack of self-esteem rises to power to become a dictator like Saddam Hussein, Osama Bin Laden or Hasan Sabbah, but the inferiority complex consumes his soul and he acts dictatorially no matter at what level of the society he is positioned. He seeks power. He needs to demonstrate himself and prove to the world that he is somebody. He is conscious of his own devalued selfhood. He starves for recognition and dreads being ignored. He feels abandoned, humiliated and victimized and hence he seeks revenge. This too was echoed by Dr. Mahathir, who called upon the Muslims to acquire “*guns and rockets, bombs and warplanes, tanks and warships*” to get their rights from their “*detractors and enemies*”.

The Prime Minister was right! Muslim men are oppressed and humiliated. The truth is, however, that their humiliation has nothing to do with the Jews. It has to do with how they were raised; it has to do with how their mothers were raised and it has to do with how Islam treats women. Women who have no self-esteem cannot raise sons with high self-esteem. What we get are

men with bruised egos, who seek power and recognition to overcome their inferiority complex. Is it any wonder that the mother of Osama bin Laden was the least favorite wife of his father's numerous wives? Osama grew up with a mother with low self-esteem and inherited her sense of inferiority. Today Osama is fighting against his own devalued self by trying to become a hero to those Muslims who applaud and approve his acts of terror.

Men with low self-esteem are dangerous. Lee Harvey Oswald killed J.F. Kennedy for no other reason than to prove himself -- to prove that he is important and can do something big. All these humiliated men want is to prove themselves, even if it is as assassins or terrorists. Those men who were responsible for the massacre of the 9/11 and all those who strap bombs to their waists and blow up themselves and kill others to become martyrs, suffer from the devalued self. The thought of becoming heroes, their pictures published in the newspapers and shown to the world for young men who see no worth in their lives is exhilarating. They are nobody when alive, but they will be famous and even heroes and martyrs when dead. The call to glory and fame for a man who thinks he is nothing but failure is irresistible.

The self anointed prophet of Arabia could never imagine that his obsession to control his wives would one day bring the world to the brink of destruction. As if, a narcissist like him would have given a hoot!

The prosecution demands total condemnation of the defendant Mr. Muhammad bin Abdullah for taking away the rights of women, for reducing them to the level of chattel and livestock and thus giving birth to a sick society of emotionally scarred men, with humongous egos, unable to function harmoniously in a world of equals and not capable to be happy, positive and

content. They fail in relationships with their spouses and children unless it is patriarchal. They fail in the society unless it is dictatorial. They perpetuate the cycle of abuse, humiliation and dictatorship ad infinitum. Little men who are hurt inside, because their emotional needs were not met by their ignorant and equally emotionally needy mothers, wear masks of denial and grandiosity, hide inside the highly inflated and highly inflammable egos, are explosively dangerous to themselves, and in such a great number, to the entire world.

Among all the crimes perpetrated by the defendant, all his killings and lootings, raps and pedophilia, slavery and genocide, this is the most injurious one. Misogyny has been more devastating to Muslims than anything else. Although women were the direct targets of misogyny, the damage caused by this evil has victimized each and every follower of Muhammad. A sick society has "evolved" with timid men, self pitying men, arrogant, ego centered, violent and angry men, hate mongers, and war mongers.

I call upon the Jury to condemn the defendant unanimously and strongly for the crime of misogyny. This is the crime against humanity.

References:

[1] http://anwary-islam.com/battle/ghazwah_uhud.htm

[2] Bukhari Volume 3, Book 43, Number 648:

[3] Bukhari, v1, bk 8, sunnah 395.

[4] Quran, 33:30

[5] Quran, 33:32

[6] Qurna, 4:34

[7] Quran 2:228

[8] Bukhari Volume 2, Book 18, Number 161

[9] Quran.4:34

[10] Razi, At-tafsir al-Kabir, on Q. 4:34.

[11] Muslim Book 11, Number 2135)

[12] Bukhari Volume 1, Book 6, Number 301

[13] Quran: 30.21

[15] Quoted in Soroush, Abdolkarim, *Farbehtar az ideoloji*, Sera't, Tehran, 1373 A.H.S.). [A.H.S. = After the Hegira, in Solar years].

[14] Bukhari Volume 4, Book 54, Number 460.

[16] Sahih Muslim Book 008, Number 3367:

[17] Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 122

[18] Mishkat al-Masabih, English translation, Book I, Section 'Duties of husband and wife', Hadith No. 61.

[19] Kanz-el-Ummal, Vol. 22, Hadith No. 858. See also Ihy'a

[20] The World Book Dictionary: Uloum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al-Kotob al-Elmeyah, Beirut, Vol II, Kitab Adab al-Nikah, p. 65.

[21] Ihy'a Uloum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al-Kotob al-Elmeyah, Beirut, Vol II, Kitab Adab al-Nikah, p. 65. Reported by Tirmizi as a true and good Ahadith

[22] Ihy'a Uloum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al-Kotob al-Elmeyah, Beirut, Vol II, Kitab Adab al-Nikah, p. 65. Reported by Tirmizi as a true and good Ahadith

[23] (Ibn Katheer vl.1, pg.498)

[24] Al-Musanaf by Abu Bakr Ahmad Ibn 'Abd Allah Ibn Mousa Al-Kanadi who lived 557H., Vol. 1 Part 2, p. 263. See also Ihy'a 'Uloum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al- Kotob al-Elmeyah, Beirut, Vol II, Kitab Adab al-Nikah, p. 52.

[25] Ihy'a Ulum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al-Kotob al-'Elmeyah, Beirut, Vol II, Kitab Adab al-Nikah, p. 34.

- [26] Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 33
- [27] Sahih Muslim Book 008, Number 3466
- [28] Book 008, Number 3240
- [29] Volume 9, Book 88, Number 219
- [30] Sahih Bukhari 2.194
- [31] Muslim Book 004, Number 1032
- [32] Bukhari Volume 9, Book 87, Number 163
- [33] Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 33
- [34] Razi, At-tafsir al-Kabir, commenting on Q. 4:3
- [35] Mishkat al-Masabih, Book 1, duty towards children Hadith No. 43.
- [36] Ihya Ulum ed-Din by Ghazali, Dar al-Kotob al-Elmeyah, Beirut, vol. II, Kitab Adab al-Nikah, p. 45.
- [37] Ibid., p. 35
- [38] Bukhari Volume 4, Book 55, Number 623
- [39] For further studies, read Abul Kasem's book on women available online and an excellent essay written by M. Rafiqul-Haq and P. Newton called *The Place of Women in Pure Islam* also available online.

Woman wants to be beaten only once a week

On September 22, 2004 a sad report came out of Iran and was spread through the Internet that ironically many found amusing. It was about an Iranian woman, beaten every day by her husband, who asked a court to tell him to beat her only once a week.

The 'Aftab-e-Yazd' daily reported that Maryam, the middle-aged woman, said she did not want to divorce her husband because she loved him. *"Just tell him to beat me once a week ... Beating is part of his nature and he cannot stop it,"* Maryam told the court. When the court prohibited the husband from beating

the wife, he protested: *"If I do not beat her, she will not be scared enough to obey me"*.

In this comic/tragic drama lie two very sad realities that affect all Muslim women irrespective of their nationalities. The first is that Muslim women are raised to accept abuse as normal. Since childhood they are treated differently. In Islamic countries boys are preferred to girls. Girls are the source of disappointment to their fathers and an embarrassment to their mothers. If a woman gives birth to a boy, she is lauded but if the child is a girl, she is snubbed and chided. Little girls learn from infancy on that they are unwanted. At the table their brothers eat first and take the lion's share. In poorer families, the female members cook and serve the males, then wait until these have had their fill. Thereafter the women scavenge the leftovers.

Boys get the first opportunity to go to school and get ahead in life. Girls are often denied this chance for there seems to be no need for them to become educated, since there are few work opportunities for women in Islamic societies. All to which a girl can aspire is to get married to a man who will take care of her. She inherits half of what her brothers inherit and has fewer rights. The rationale is that she would not need it because it is up to her husband to maintain her.

Daughters are liabilities to their families and they are "given away" in marriage as soon as possible. That could be as young as 9 years old. All this conditioning happens with the blessing of *"the best and the most perfect religion"* of Islam. After all it was Muhammad who said women are *"deficient in intelligence"* [Bukhari: 1.6.301, Muslim: 2.24.541]. It was he who said men have a "degree of advantage over women" (2:228). It was he who said women who disobey their husband "should be beaten" (4:34). If Islam is the most perfect religion, then how can one dispute its teachings?

Thus Muslim women grow up knowing only one reality and that is they are inferior to men and must please them if they want to survive. The brainwashing is so complete that many Muslim women actually fight to preserve their lower status. Many of them insist on wearing veil and pride themselves in their servitude and lower rank.

In Islamic societies the abused are as much dependent on the abuser as the latter is on the former. A good definition of this symbiotic man/woman relationship in Islamic countries is sadomasochism or to use a more modern term—codependency. Muslim women have been abused and humiliated since their birth and this is the only form of existence they have ever known and are “comfortable” with. They learn from very early on that to survive or even get ahead, they have to please the men around them. Men also learn that women are worthless, deceitful and untrustworthy creatures. Therefore men grow up with no respect for women, their intelligence and their dignity. These men learn to abuse their sisters and beat them just as their fathers beat their mothers and they will eventually beat their wives with complete clarity of conscience. Muslim men grow up with the understanding that it is their God given right to beat their women and Muslim women grow up accepting the right of their husbands to beat them.

All this is the pernicious **psycho-religious** effect of a nefarious religion that will not go away as long as this religion is believed and practiced.

The other sad reality is the **socio-economic** effect of Islam on women’s lives. In Islamic countries all doors are closed to women. There are little to no opportunities available for women to live productive and independent lives. They have little education and no job training. All they know is household chores. If women do not marry and do not find a husband who

would take care of them, they will have a very difficult life. Marriage is the only hope a Muslim woman has for her own survival. She knows that too. She knows that she has to marry soon and that if she is dumped, her future will be ruined.

In Islamic countries, the patrimony of the family is not divided equally between the estranged husband and wife but rather, the man keeps everything, as everything has been his earnings. The Quran makes it clear that everything is his property and a good woman is one who takes care of her husband's property.

The work of the woman in keeping her husband's house orderly, cooking for him and raising his numerous children is not recognized as work and hence after a divorce she is entitled to nothing. She will also lose the custody of her children as in Islam women are nothing but incubators for the children of their husbands. All she can get is her *mahr* (a fee agreed upon prenuptially) that often is only a token and sums up to nothing. It could be something as insignificant as a dress. Women often do not demand too much for *mahr*, not only because Muhammad insisted that good women should also be cheap but also because if they become too demanding they risk not marrying at all and that would be a great disgrace to them and to their families.

Divorce could mean disaster for a Muslim woman. It not only means she will lose her social status but she could actually face starvation. If she is not young enough to re-marry, she will be forced to find menial works. Work is not readily available to women in Islamic countries. The only work available is domestic and janitorial work, which is poorly paid and very demeaning. Only the lucky ones can get jobs as maids. Many divorced women will end up in the streets as beggars, or as it happens in Iran, as prostitutes.

Thus, it is understandable that Muslim women prefer an abusing husband who beats them regularly to divorce. This also

explains why women consent to sharing their husbands with second, third or fourth co-wives. They know that the alternative is divorce and that means facing a very bleak future of uncertainties and assured poverty.

Stigmatization is just one dilemma that a divorced woman faces. The real challenge is survival after the divorce. Only after we take into consideration the psycho-religious and the socio-economic factors that subjugate Muslim women can we appreciate the gravity of the problem and understand why Maryam would be happy if her husband beats her only once a week instead of everyday. Only then do we understand why she says that she still loves him. Maryam knows perfectly well that if her abusive and savage husband dumps her, she will have to either commit suicide or live a life of abject poverty and misery. All Maryam wants is to live. Isn't this the basic instinct of all living beings? She is willing to be beaten once a week for that privilege. Maryam is willing to keep her psychopathic husband content by allowing him to beat her regularly so she can continue to live her wretched life.

To Maryam and to millions of Muslim women who live in abusive relationships and in abusive societies, life is not a right but a privilege. It is a privilege that they have to earn by pleasing their husbands even if it means enduring their violent tantrums.

Muslim women with no husbands have no hopes. If they are divorced or if they are widowed, if they have no huge inheritance and if they can't find another husband, they have no future. They are outcasts and burdens to the society and to themselves. Death is far more enticing to them than this dismal and miserable life. Perhaps this explains the *raison d'être* of the Chechen Black Widows. These women have lost their husbands and being Muslim women there is nothing left for them but to die. However, as good Muslims they want to take their revenge and

kill as many innocent people as they can before they face their own coveted death.

Abuse of women is one of the problems facing the Muslim world and it is not a minor one. Unfortunately there is no resolution to this problem unless Islam is eradicated from these societies. Misogyny is just one of the many symptoms of the sick Islamic world. The disease is Islam!